

special
collections
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

THE
REPLY
OF A
NEAR OBSERVER,
TO SOME OF THE
ANSWERERS
OF THE
CURSORY REMARKS.

Raptabatque Viri mendacis viscera Tullus
Per Silvas —— At tu dictis Albane inaneres.

VIRG.

London:

Printed by C. Rickaby, Peterborough-court, Fleet-st &c;
FOR J. HATCHARD, BOOKSELLER TO HER MAJESTY,
No. 190.
OPPOSITE ALBANY-HOUSE, PICCADILLY.

1804.

AC 911. 1804. B46

THE
R E P L Y
OF A
NEAR OBSERVER,
&c. &c.

I BELIEVE the public either looks for, or will easily pardon, some notice from me, of more than one of the numerous publications which have appeared as answers to the Cursory Remarks upon the State of Parties during the present Administration.

Not, as I presume, that it condemns the silence and disregard with which I have treated the folly and violence of the factions which have assailed me, or that it can be expected at my hands to refute the absurd and ridiculous accusation of calumny and misrepresentation, which it has been judged expedient by all, or for all, of those writers to prefer against me; but because the credit and accuracy of my observation have at length been openly disputed, almost with the name and authentic character of the Right Hon. Gentleman who formerly presided over His Majesty's Cabinet, and because the Chancellor of the Exche

quer, and all his friends, are repeatedly challenged* to controvert his statements.

Certainly it belongs to me, (who have asserted, that the public and posterity have a right to truth, and who think that it is our duty to give it them) to contradict and refute whatever part of a work, so ushered and accredited, I may *know*, or have strong and unconquerable reasons for believing, to be false. I shall not shrink from this unpleasant and ungrateful task.

That the Plain Answer is Mr. PITT's case; that the writer has *his* brief, his cause, and his commission, it requires no near observation to discover—it breathes his spirit and his character, and predicts his very words and opinions†.—It professes to come from his closet, and its professions are accredited by “the Member of Parliament‡.” Certainly it is Mr. PITT's case, or it is nothing, and as certainly it is the authority, not the author, that elicits any notice from me.

The common object of both the P. Answerer and the Member of Parliament is to represent the Cursory Remarks as full of misrepresentations

* Plain Answer, pp. 24 and 27.

† If it did not come from under Mr. PITT's eye, at least the prophetic note, in p. 69, cannot be accounted for by human means. See Debate on the Army Estimates, Dec. 10, 1803.

‡ “As that author (P. A.) is known to write from the highest authority, he who wishes to get at truth will do well to read that whole page, for the *real situation and sentiments of Mr. PITT.*” P. 58, note.

and

and calumnies. This eternal petition of the question commences with the title-page of the former.—Is it a false accusation?—What then is the character of the Plain Answerer?

The Member of Parliament is of my opinion. Notwithstanding a great deal of abuse, more becoming (if becoming any where) a petty sesson and a little lawyer, than the character he affixes to his book, he justifies me against his own charge and that of his precursor; “for,” says he, “before the public were in possession of the opposing statements of this celebrated affair, I remember when both were originally made known in more confined circles, that many moderate persons, the friends of both (parties, I presume) lamented the obvious disagreement of their assertions*.” Where then is the *malevolence* of my statement? How have “*I* thrown the apple of discord†?”

This is certainly a singular charge, from those too who brandish the torch of the Furies—from those who voted with Mr. PATTEN, or with Mr. PITT, for immediate or suspended impeachment, whose occupation it has been from the beginning, to snap the bond of friendship, and cancel that of honour between the present and the late Ministers. Had it not been for these accusers themselves, my flaming apple had hung still green upon its branch.

* M. P. p. 66.

† P. A.

Nothing

Nothing can be more adverse and contradictory than the general testimony of these extraordinary witnesses. Yet in some things they have a miraculous agreement. The P.A. asserts, that the name of ADDINGTON and success "have rarely been coupled ;" the Member of Parliament is "*bound* to wonder at his good fortune ;" the P. A. certifies, that Mr. PITT "disapproved" of Mr. CANNING's conduct, and that "much mutual dissatisfaction" prevailed between them. The Member of Parliament cannot admit this statement ; "he never heard of it," &c. &c. But in this they consent and concur, if rival servility can be called concurrence, to draw the same conclusion from their most opposite statements ; to think Mr. PITT either has not broken his word, or has a privilege to break it, like that citizen of Sparta, who, being taxed with falsehood in an assembly of Greece, replied, that he was a freeman, and had a right to lie whenever he thought proper ; or, like the Stoic, who maintains, that it is easier to prove drunkenness a virtue, than CATO vicious. In this too they agree most marvellously, an affected contempt for their opponents, and a real one for the opinion of the public, and for truth. Hence it is that, without blushing, these philosophers contradict themselves and each other, that they libel and belie while they complain of calumny and misrepresentation, and audaciously commit,

commit, without a mask, the crime which they pretend to detect in another.

The P. Answerer says*, the Cursory Remarks "are of curious workmanship, wrought with some ingenuity, but of so thin a texture, that a distant Observer may see without difficulty the spots and deformities they are intended to hide."—Curious veil! and curious workmanship! which, constructed with ingenuity, hide nothing even from distant eyes!—More curious calumnies!—more wonderful misrepresentations! which have disturbed the temper and the reputation of veteran Ministers; which, anonymous as they are, and disapproved (as it is asserted) by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, are still so vivacious, so triumphant, that they require the hand of Mr. PITT himself to brush them away! By what art, what spell, what magic, could such mean and wicked instruments have required a hundred champions in succession to combat them, till, blessed with perpetual victory, they call forth the great giant of the castle, on his last drawbridge, to avenge his defeated knights, and fight bodily for life?

That charm, that talisman, is Truth; it is under her invulnerable banner that **ALONE**, and weak, and opposed to the most fearful odds, I still dare the combat; still am bold in the cause. *Disap-*

* P. 2.

proved

proved by the Chancellor of the Exchequer? I hope not; as a Near Observer, I think not; but disapproved is nothing, unless I am disapproved also. My credentials are from my enemies. I have professed a desire to serve, not to flatter, government; I have pointed to its weaknesses. I say, I stand **ALONE**. The Chancellor of the Exchequer cannot disclaim me with more earnestness than, upon this occasion, I must take the liberty to disclaim him—

“ *This enterprize no man partakes with me.*”

It is impossible to prove a negative. I cannot establish that the Secretaries of the Treasury, or the First Lord himself, have not circulated my book; I cannot shew that the Noble Secretary of State has not sent them “under his cover to foreign courts,” as the Member of Parliament declares he can adduce ocular testimony that he has done. I most solemnly and sacredly, however, protest and record my utter disbelief of every one of these allegations. I declare I do not believe that there exists in the whole, or in any branch of the administration, a resolution sufficient to have done so. I think they want “gall to make oppression bitter,” and that Mr. PITT may impeach them as often as he dares with impunity. Do I expect credit for this asseveration from the P. Answerer, and the Member of Parliament? No. For I do not desire they should do themselves the wrong to suspect veracity in other bosoms, or ascribe a virtue

tue to a stranger, of which they cannot justify the imputation by the remotest analogy of their soul.

It is to the public I appeal, to that tribunal I evoke my cause. With what probability, what coherence am I accused of malice towards Mr. PITT—I, who have not even mentioned the inflammatory and factious paper (to give it no more formal qualification) which he transmitted to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, in the vindictive moment of his resignation? With what semblance of probability (upon what ground, what motive, besides the pure love and reverence of truth), should I falsely disclaim the confidence of the Chief Minister of the King, which is imputed to me, and that too in the nicest and most delicate conjectures? Ought I to be ashamed at seeing my pages adopted and accredited under the seal of the Foreign Office, and recommended to the Courts and Ministers of Europe by His Majesty's most responsible representatives? My task would be easier, if Mr. PITT's advocates would entertain a little more respect for the common faculties and understanding of other men. My credentials (I repeat it) are from themselves. Their own contradictions, their own inadvertent confessions, their own palpable frauds, falsehoods, and evasions, their own intemperate and malicious resentments.

It is scarcely possible to undertake, or even to imagine, a task more unpleasant than is mine. It is my misfortune to have, in matters of fact, the most

most unscrupulous, and, in argument and assertion, the boldest and the most uncandid, adversary. False reasoning may be exposed, but false facts cannot easily be combatted, without feelings painful to gentlemen; and something always seems to be left ambiguous, some room for doubt and hesitation between contradictory assertions. If, however, I shall convict him of wilful malignity and perversion upon topics before the public, and in particulars capable of direct and perfect demonstration, it will be hardly possible for any man to give him entire credence upon subjects more delicate and difficult of approach. If I shall detect him plainly misrepresenting the most known and authentic proceedings in Parliament, his word will hardly prevail in secret and almost inaccessible transactions; and the world will not fail, with me, to protest the extravagant bills he has drawn upon credulity at sight.

If after this, or before it, the Plain Answerer can induce the public of this enlightened country, (what part too of the public?) to believe that Mr. PITT, " did not feel a sufficient desire to resume the reins of power ;" * that the failure of the negotiation for that object, produced " no disappointment, or mortification ;" that he " felt his mind relieved" † by the miscarriage of the treaty; that he moved the order of the day on Mr. PATTEN's motion for impeachment, " out of ten-

* P. A. pp. 50, 51.

+ P. 51.

dernes

derness to Ministers," and, to prevent Mr. PATTEN!! (heaven bless him!) from " forcing them from His Majesty's Councils."* If he can convince the public, that " Mr. PITT has not commenced a systematic opposition ;" that he could not have " controuled" the indignation of Mr. CANNING, at Mr. ADDINGTON's presumption and incapacity ; that Mr. ADDINGTON " dictated terms" to him, &c.&c. why then it will be certainly in vain for me to contest such points as these, that " he made a distinct offer to retain his situation, to the end of the war,"† that he limited his promise of support to the new Ministers to " *three conditions*," with twenty other positions equally false and incredible, of which, (as a Near Observer) I consider it as incumbent upon me to declare my total ignorance, and most unequivocal disbelief.

I have said " the public and posterity have a right to the truth," but the P. A. who would have denied the rotundity of the earth, or the motion of the moon, if I had any where asserted them, thinks " the people have no right to complain of Mr. PITT and his friends, for quitting their posts, without explaining the causes of their resignation."‡ This opinion is the more extraordinary, as the very first paragraph of his book says, " the public has much concern and interest in the real character of those, who are at

* P. A. p. 53. † P. 17 ‡ P. 7.

present,

present, or are, at any time, likely to be Ministers."—How likely Mr. PITT may be to return to his official situation, I have had no means very lately of observing; but, unless he very much changes his course, I fear the speculative gratitude cannot be long kept alive upon the hopes or wishes of his Plain Answerer. But it is not because a man may be, or be likely to be a Minister, that I can attach exclusively all public concern and interest, in his character; is it nothing that he has been a Minister? that his name is inscribed in the front page of the most interesting and the most unhappy period of our history? Is history nothing? is truth nothing? are the cause and motive of events nothing? and shall we leave nothing but a barren chronological rubric of occurrences unexplained, unaccounted for, and unaccountable, behind us?

In February, 1801, Mr. PITT resigned!!—Will posterity be content with this information, and ought we to be so? I am sure not. We have, therefore, a right to complain, that the causes of his resignation have not been explained. But we have a heavier cause to complain, that it has been attempted to pervert the truth of facts, and overturn the foundations of history, in order to palliate the disgrace of this unexplained resignation, at the most terrible moment, and the most memorable crisis, which our nation has ever sustained.

I have

I have been most ungratefully accused of exaggeration by the advocates of Mr. PITT, in the rapid sketch I have drawn of this melancholy epocha. And yet, as far as regards the state of the Continent, the P. A. admits in terms, "that he has nothing to object to the correctness of my statement."* Now if that statement be correct, the impure dominion of Bonaparte was established in Spain, Italy, Piedmont, Switzerland, in the fertile provinces along the banks of the Rhine, to its discharge in the German Ocean. Holland was conquered and governed like a province, Belgium incorporated, the three great powers of the North were confederates with France in a monstrous league, of which it was the object to cut off the sources of our naval greatness and security. The House of Austria was subdued and broken, and had almost disappeared out of Europe, at the treaty of Lunéville. Prussia, profligate and helpless, was perhaps an unwilling satellite of France; the Empire, writhing under the tortures of dislocation and dismemberment; Portugal and the Turk our weakness, not our strength; and the victorious Consul of France, irritated by the insolent tone of Lord GRENVILLE's repulse, and the dictation of those weak and variable minds, which had crouched to Barras and Reubell, was preparing to invade us with revengeful arms, escorted by the squadrons of Spain, Holland, and the Baltic!

* P. A. p. 10.

Thus

Thus far, I conceive, the Plain Answerer and all the host of Mr. PITT's advocates, (Mr. CANNING excepted) to admit; that Right Honorable Gentleman, indeed, thinks * that "our state was the *reverse of calamitous*; no succession was ever so *desireable*, no situation so *tempting*, as that of the new Ministers," which most extraordinary, and for ever memorable opinion, stands eternally recorded against his name, in the Parliamentary History of his country!

Tantum infelicem nimium dilexit Amicum!

It is, therefore, in the domestic statement that I have been guilty of exaggeration.† My misre-

* P. Reg. November 23, 1802.

† I have certainly been guilty of an inadvertency, which, with the usual candour of the P. A. is exaggerated into a design, in one expression, by which the King's illness might be understood as having taken place previous to the resignations. It is in the recollection of the country, that those events followed so close, and are so interwoven with each other, that the resignations could not be completed until His Majesty's most providential recovery. But, I confess my surprise, that Mr. PITT's friends should be so anxious to correct an error, which alters nothing in the *desireable* situation of the new Ministers, and which, certainly, if it had arisen in design, must have arisen in a kind and merciful one towards him in particular. I protest I cannot understand the motive of vindicating, with so much care, the seniority of the resignations and the Catholic discussion in the closet, to the lamented malady of the King; I cannot divine, in what arises this nice anxiety, to filiate event and cause, in circumstances so disastrous and unhappy. It is certainly fit, however, that I should correct my mistake. It is the sole one, to which any consequence could be attached, that I am conscious of having fallen into.

presentations

presentations and calumnies, are confined to home!

It appears I have given considerable offence in supposing that the war had grown unpopular, and that doubts began to be entertained of the capacity of the late Ministers for conducting it. "What ground," I am asked, "is there for saying that the war had grown unpopular and hopeless, what for asserting, that the simple disappointment received at Ferrol, caused more discontent and despondency than, at earlier periods of the war, had arisen from all our mistakes and misfortunes in St. Domingo, Corsica, Quiberon, and North Holland?" and I am referred to the silence of the Journals of Parliament, for the refutation of my position.

It is a little remarkable, that the very next paragraph of the P.A. admits "the very slight probability of obtaining the ultimate object of the war, and the increased risk of attempting it,"* and not less so, that Sir JAMES PULTENEY was obliged to justify his conduct, and accounted, in his place in the House of Commons, for this *disappointment* at Ferrol, although I cannot find any parliamentary trace of a *compte rendu* by Lord MELVILLE, or Mr. WINDHAM, of their extraordinary successes at Quiberon and Schagenbrugh.

Thus far the proceedings of Parliament have

* P. 12.

been

been unluckily appealed to by the late Ministers ; I confess, however, although they are in my favour, it is not always there, and never exclusively, that during the late administration any candid man would look for the history of public opinion.

Mr. PITT, however, could have told his amanuensis, that whether it were at Ferrol, or in the Baltic, or at El-Arisch, that his popularity began to droop, at the period when he thought proper to espouse the Cathelic Question so devoutly, and when it became so *urgent*, as to compel him to agitate, with so much perseverance, the Royal conscience upon that most unfortunate topic, Petitions, particularly in the Northern Counties, were actually preparing against the prolongation of hostilities, and that the tables of the Houses of Parliament, to which I am now so indecently referred, to find the negative popularity of the war, were about to be buried under the expression of popular discontent and distrust. Was I very malicious in suppressing this circumstance in the character of the period of his resignation ?

We are told, however, that the public was less weary of the war, at the time I am speaking of, than it had been in 1795, 1796, and 1797.* This would be extraordinary indeed if it could be ascertained, because, during the greater part of those years, we had warlike, and often victorious allies upon the continent, and because, we cer-

* P. 12.

tainly

tainly did not then enjoy near two hundred millions of debt or taxes, which have since, no doubt, contributed to render the war so much less intolerable, and burthensome.

I come now to three points of very considerable importance, upon which it had, perhaps, been more discreet if the P. Answerer had not been advised to challenge me so imperiously. These are, the unfortunate rupture of the treaty of El-Arisch—the inadequacy of the Egyptian Expedition—and the treaty of adjournment at Copenhagen, on the 29th of August, 1780. I conceive that upon all these topics, not only did the public shew symptoms of dissatisfaction and anxiety, but that, without great injury and *danger* to the late Ministers, it cannot be contended (in the last instance in particular) that there was no cause for despondency, and that they did not feel it.

As to the fatal orders which caused the violation of the convention at El-Arisch, the massacre of the Turkish troops at Heliopolis, and the whole expence and loss of our brave armies, to whose valour, under Providence, we owe exclusively the recovery of that treaty at Cairo, the P.A. very flippantly says it is “a mere question of policy.”* Does he then really believe, that all this blood will sink into the ground, and all the guilt of shedding it transpire and evaporate in a metaphysical alembic? A question of policy? No,

* Pp. 13 and 14.

E

without

without question those orders were of the very seminal essence and sublimed spirit of impolicy, and imprudence; as the defence of them is the very *caput mortuum*, and sediment of absurdity and falsehood.

There can be no dispute, but that these unfortunate instructions, were the consequence of the sanguine view which the late Ministers had taken of affairs * in Egypt, from the Intercepted Correspondence of the French Army, after the
evasion

* “ On the 15th December, 1799,” says the advocate of the late Ministers, “ the British Government having reason to believe, that proposals would be made for the evacuation of Egypt by the French troops, upon condition of being suffered to return unmolested to France, sent instructions to Lord KEITH, not to consent to any such convention. The bad faith with which such engagements had been kept by the French Government, and the danger which would arise at that particular period, from the return to Europe of so large a force, appear to be the motives which governed the conduct of His Majesty’s Ministers in giving those orders. As soon as they learnt that, before the receipt of those orders, Sir SIDNEY SMITH had concluded a Convention upon the terms of the return of the French troops to their own country, although without any stipulation to prevent their serving immediately in Europe, the British Government sent orders to the Admiral not to obstruct the execution of this treaty.”

“ Before these second orders reached Lord KEITH, he had, according to his instructions, notified his former orders to the French General, the consequence of which was, the immediate renewal of hostilities. What then is meant by the violation of the treaty of El-Arisch? The whole responsibility to which the late Ministers are subjected by this transaction, depends upon the *policy* of giving the orders of the 15th of December, 1799. In discussing

evasion of General Bonaparte. It was a false view, and dearly has their country paid for their mistake. Elated to intoxication by the exaggerated pictures and caricatures of those military satyrists, they indulged the most sanguine and extravagant visions of glory, and dreamed of extinguishing, in the unconditional surrender of Kleber and his army, the memory of all their defeats and disgraces in St. Domingo, Corsica, and Holland !

Will they deny that they were misled by the Correspondence? that they gave entire and unqualified credit to it, which no prudent government would have done? no matter. But had they no remorse, no scruple, nor doubt, whether it were quite honest or honorable towards the allied court of Constantinople, and the miserable inhabitants of Egypt, to detain by force an unwilling invader in their country? to shut up their destroyer in their cities, and chain them to their destruction? Will the P. A. assert, that no discontent or dissatisfaction prevailed upon this account? Oh! "but Ministers were influenced by the dangers, which existed from the return of discussing this question we must remember, that at this time, the chief hope of the war rested upon the events of the Continental campaign, which, in the quarter that would in all probability have been principally affected by the return of the French troops, was terminated in favour of the enemy, by a hard-fought battle, and which, at one period, was even considered as gained by our allies."—P. A. pp. 13 and 14.

that army to Europe." Monstrous absurdity! what danger existed, but to **BONAPARTE** and his green usurpation, from the return of his injured and mutinous troops? Let them make their election. If they did not believe the French Correspondence, they have no excuse for their order; if they did believe, then they must have known that they could not have assisted Austria, and annoyed the First Consul, more effectually than by sending back to France forty thousand armed witnesses of his crimes and his flight; forty thousand veteran troops, complaining of their wrongs, with **KLEBER** at their head, to dispute his raw and tottering authority. *

Shall we admit this late-found and fictitious excuse, that they were afraid least the return of **KLEBER** and his army should have turned the nice balance of the war in Europe; and that they had a right to sacrifice our allies, the Turks, who had made peace, in order to save our allies the Austrians, who remained at war? What hindered (Egypt being delivered at El-Arisch) that the Bri-

* " Fortunate was it for **BONAPARTE** that the hand of an assassin deprived **KLEBER** of his life. His word was passed, his resolution fixed, to take ample vengeance, nor did personal resentment only urge him. The public wrong he had also pledged himself to redress, neither would the aggrandizement of his rival have humiliated him by servile obsequiousness, and dereliction of his oath. The apology which **KLEBER** (notwithstanding his private sentiments and resolution) framed for Bonaparte, might have cost him his life—so odious was that General to the Army." *Sir Robert Wilson*, p. 146.

tish

tish arms should correct this inequality upon the Continent of Europe? why was it necessary to trim the balance upon the confines of Africa? why might not the very army of ABERCROMBIE, with the same valour, and the same good providence, have defended Portugal, or garrisoned Genoa, or reaped eternal laurels at Marengo? The P. A. admits the nice and critical fortune of that celebrated day, which has laid half Europe prostrate before the abhorred dominion of BONAPARTE. Could it escape him then, that not the army destined to repair our error in Egypt, but a single regiment of English, must in all human calculation, have fixed the fortune of that fluctuating day to the standards of the Germans, and that half the world was lost by *his mere question of policy?* Can it escape him, that if the late Ministers had permitted Egypt to be delivered, Europe had been saved, and that if KLEBER had returned to France, BONAPARTE could never have seen Marengo?

All this, however, no doubt is pure malice and misrepresentation! be it so—but what excuse will they make, for launching this rash and violent commission to the very bottom of the Mediterranean, without one saving clause for the discretion of our commanders on the spot? without one proviso for the case, that the convention should have been signed *before* the arrival of the order? The responsibility of the late Ministers, therefore,

is not confined to a mere question of policy, for if any one could be absurd enough to think, that the object of their orders were politic, they would still remain responsible for having sent them out so rash, so unweighed and inconsiderate, as to counteract their own intentions, which were not to disturb the convention, if it had actually been concluded: an imprudence the more extraordinary and unpardonable, as they confess, the order proceeded upon their knowledge of the intention of the French to propose the evacuation of Egypt, and as the commonest calculation of time and distance, would have taught a child that this proposal must have been decided upon long before the possibility of receiving advices back again from England.

Accordingly when General KLEBER received information of this order, from Sir SIDNEY SMITH, the formalities of the treaty were not only completed, but the French General was actually within *five hours* of the appointed time for the evacuation of Cairo! The Turks I have said were massacred at Heliopolis: for it was a bloody and cowardly massacre, and not a battle.—“Certainly,” says Sir R. WILSON,* “they had so depended upon the execution of the treaty, that they had advanced without artillery and ammunition!!”

“ Does not this run like iron through your soul?”

It is well known, that the Vizier demanded

and obtained the dismission of Sir SIDNEY SMITH in consequence of this horrible transaⁿction, and of the *mere question of policy* which occasioned it. The man who had saved his country, and half the civilized world, at Acre and El-Arisch, was expelled from Egypt, and has yet to expect his recompence from a grateful country, or the late, but surer gratitude of posterity. The Ministers, who have the endless responsibility of this frantic order upon their conscience,* desire to govern again the greatest empire of the universe, and claim to be the sole men capable of governing it! —Was it malicious in the Cursory Remarks to have kept silence upon circumstances like these?

I shall now answer the next imprudent question of the Plain Answerer, and endeavour to satisfy him upon what reasons I ventured to consider the expedition, destined by the late Administration to repair this atrocious folly, as utterly

* Was it from the Council-table or the dinner-table, where the savage Germans used to deliberate, that these orders were issued? — What, to forget one clause to save the very case that was in contemplation? to send out the very order that they *did not mean*? namely, to disturb the Convention if it had taken place! — and then, when thousands of their fellow-creatures had been immolated by this furious and inebriated instruction (*which they did not intend*) to plead as a merit, that they sent out a subsequent order to agree to the execution. When it was *too late*, when our allies had been massacred, trusting and unarmed, and when the incensed enemy would listen to the terms no longer! — Is this a defence or a defiance, and a solemn mockery of the justice and understanding of mankind?

hopeless

hopeless of success at the period of the late resignations.

His pert and flippant argument shall answer itself. He states with an air of triumph, which moves my pity, “ that the principal battle was fought upon the day Mr. ADDINGTON came into office, and that the official news of it, though opened by Lord HOBART, were directed to Mr. DUNDAS,” and therefore, says he, it was Mr. PITT’s victory!—Wonderful! what, because he resigned several months before this victory was known in England, it is *his*! It belongs to him because he retired from office several months before he dreamed of it, before it was certain that the army could effect a disembarkation, while it was a problem whether it would arrive. Can the Plain Answerer deny that, when Mr. PITT tendered his resignation, the expedition was more likely to return than to effect a landing in Egypt?*

The P. A. is an unhappy and often a dangerous apologist. He excuses the inadequacy, the total incompetency of the force destined to deliver Egypt, which will descend to posterity upon the pure and sacred testimony of the brave companions of the expedition, upon a plea so perilous, that the late Administration must owe their lives

* “ The success of the disembarkation was one of those singular phenomena,” says Sir R. WILSON, “ in which mathematical improbabilities are surmounted, and victory snatched, where cold calculation would have predicted defeat.” P. 16.

and

and honour to its absolute falsity: I say, if the truth of it were established in a court of justice, it would send them infallibly to the scaffold.

This testimony, the P. A. denies to be conclusive, upon the prodigious consideration, that “ it is not improbable that the Ministers were acquainted with circumstances totally unknown to the officers of the Army, which in their judgment would sufficiently counteract any disparity of force between them and their enemies.”*

Let us see what this disparity was, to what amount it existed, and whether it had not been an act of the foulest perfidy, and treason, to have concealed from our officers any circumstances which could have counteracted it?

The British forces (including five hundred Maltese who were not disembarked) amounted, by the return made to General ABERCROMBIE upon the spot, to twelve thousand men.†.

The French army were forty thousand strong; besides their numerous auxiliaries, and besides the advantages they derived from possessing the fortresses of the country, from inurement to the climate, knowledge of the roads, river, lakes and

* P. A. p. 15.

† Sir R. W. App. p. 270.

At this time the army of the Vizier was weak in number, without discipline, and infected with the plague. Report of General MOORE, February 16, 1801.

inland navigation, abundance of provisions, water*, dromedaries, &c. &c.

That the French force is not overstated results evidently from this, that after their multiplied and bloody defeats, their ranks thinned too by flight, desertion, and the pestilence, they surrendered, in two garrisons alone, to the number of twenty-five thousand men—more than twice the force sent out by the late Ministers to combat them.†

“ It is a positive fact,” says Sir R. WILSON, “ that Sir R. ABERCROMBIE expected at the utmost calculation to find only ten thousand French, and five thousand auxiliaries in Egypt, this exceeding the number stated in the *official information* sent from here, and upon which the expedition was originally formed !!!”‡

So much for the information of the late Ministry—as for that of the army, they had not furnished the officers with “ *one correct map* of the country they were to conquer;” “ their greatest misfortune was the total want of information with regard to Egypt.”§

* Aboukir Bay was the only port where the disembarkation could have been effected upon the coast of Egypt. For there only could the shipping ever remain in safety, and the daily communication with the fleet was necessary to the army, which depended upon it daily for provisions, stores, and at first as it was supposed for water.—*Sir R. Wilson.*

† At Cairo - - - - - 13,754 } Exclusive of women
At Alexandria - - - - - 11,213 } and children.

Sir. Robert Wilson.

‡ P. 8.

§ Pp. 6 and 7.

It

It must be observed, however, that it was favourable information which the P. Answerer alleges that the late Ministers kept back from our officers—information so favourable that, in their judgment, it could counteract all this dreadful disparity and disadvantage, at which the mind still trembles, the terror of which not even certainty and success can entirely disperse or subdue. I will not demand of him to make known what these circumstances were, for the sake of his friends, who might be impeached for concealing them; but I should be glad to learn of this egregious logician, how it is possible to have counteracted the disparity by leaving the inferior party uninformed of the circumstances in its favour!

The unaffected ignorance of the late Ministers in all matters respecting Egypt is too well established to make a serious defence necessary for them against this friendly, but dangerous accusation; but if it is maintained that they had real information, and knew the smallest particle of the truth, with what decency can it be contended that they too did not consider the Egyptian expedition as *hopeless* in February 1801, when they tendered their resignation?—with what regard to their honour can they deny that despondency, from which nothing but their utter ignorance could possibly have defended them?

I am falsely accused of attributing the merit of our victories to the present Ministers; I have referred

referred them most humbly and most unfeignedly to the inscrutable order and good Providence of heaven ! I have said, and I do not repent of my expression, that, " according to all human calculation and probability, the expedition could not have been crowned with success*." The present Ministers, however, are entitled to this applause at least, that they knew how to use this success ; that they repaired the error of their predecessors, by recovering, as the price of victory, *that TREATY OF EL-ARISCH* which had so wantonly been cancelled, and at the expence of so much blood ! They might claim too the merit of having sent out powerful reinforcements at a time of great perplexity and difficulty, when the militia had been broken up and spent by their predecessors, and when there remained scarcely any regular forces in the kingdom†.

* Sir R. WILSON says that, " destiny seems to have taken in this expedition the sole possible way to success, and has left the impression of her power in the mind of every man employed in it."

† In the beginning of July 1801, General COOTE, who commanded before Alexandria, had only 3,200 men—fit for duty in his camp to carry on the siege!!! when there arrived the 22d Dragoons, a battalion of the Guards, 2d battalion of the 20th regiment of Infantry, the 24th, 25th, 26th regiments, the ancient Irish Fencibles, besides drafts for several regiments, and about 1,800 Swiss, and other foreign troops in British pay, enlisted from the army of his S. H. the Prince of Condé, which was disbanded after the treaty of Lunéville.

The

The next point in dispute is the Convention of Copenhagen in August 1800, which, with his usual happiness, the P. A. complains of my calling “a treaty of adjournment at the expence of some implied and virtual admissions, which in happier times could never have been extorted from a British Cabinet.”—“If there was any extortion in this treaty,” says its apologist, “it consisted in our obliging our adversary as a preliminary (*pendente lite*) to give up the object in dispute until we should be enabled, with greater means in our hands of enforcing our demands, to treat with him for the final acquiescence in them.”* Let the world decide between him and me!

It is necessary to take a brief retrospect of the treaty, and of its history.

In the month of December 1799, the Danish frigate the *Hafeneu*, Captain Van - Dockum, resisted the right of visit, immemorially claimed, and I trust to be eternally asserted by the royal flag of Great Britain. I mention it only as the first *act* of resistance. The affair was compromised by the Danish government, who disavowed the conduct of their officer.

Upon the 25th of July 1800, to the astonishment of all Europe, an actual engagement took place in the mouth of the Channel between another Danish frigate, the *Freya*, Captain Crabbe, and no less than four British frigates, a brig, and a lugger, which had insisted upon visit-

* P. A. p. 15.

ing

ing her convoy. Five English seamen were killed in this extraordinary action, which terminated in the Dane and her convoy being brought into the Downs.

In consequence of this act of violence and insult, and of the reassertion of the right to cover contraband with convoy, which was the sole motive for the contest, Lord WHITWORTH was immediately dispatched upon a special and extraordinary mission to the Court of Copenhagen. To support his Excellency's remonstrances every demonstration of impending war was adopted, and on the ninth of the next month, Admiral DICKSON sailed from Yarmouth, having under his command a squadron of nine ships of the line, with bombs, gun-vessels, &c. &c.

Upon the 29th of August a convention was concluded, in presence of this powerful fleet, in which it was agreed that the *claim of Denmark should be discussed in a negotiation to be opened in London, to which the whole question was adjourned, and that the Danish frigate should be repaired at Portsmouth, and at the expence of Great Britain!*

This "the Plain Answerer" has the decency to call extorting from Denmark !

In all this convention, and in the catalogue of its extortions, there is to be found no reparation, no disavowal—what do I talk of?—no excuse, no palliation, no apology for the insult suffered

ferred by the British flag, in our own seas, in sight of our own harbours!—no satisfaction, no atonement for that brave and British blood which had flowed in defence of our dearest rights, now the subject of negociation, and which had stained, for the first time unrevenged, the ocean, blushing deeper for our shame!

How had we fallen, thro' what a space had our star declined since the preceding December, when the mighty court of Copenhagen condescended to *disavow* her commander? *

But did it require the presence of a British fleet, a British Admiral, with so many gallant officers, and their crews, to witness this opprobrious treaty with the potent Emperor of the Isle of Zealand?—to behold our blood and our honour forgotten together—to decorate the triumph of Captain Crabbe, decked out in stars and ribbands, for the very act which, eight months before, had disgraced Vandockum! Was it necessary to break the hearts of the navy of England by bringing the triumphant Freya into Portsmouth, to be repaired by British shipwrights and

* In diplomacy a *disavowal* is, I think, to be considered as a kind of “ previous question,” or “ order of the day” upon the subject in dispute; the Danes, therefore, as naturally returned to their *motion*, as Mr. PATTEN would have done to his! This “ order of the day” seems, in all its application and analogy, to be the *pierre d’achoppement* of Mr. Pitt.

with British money?—The Freya?—master of heaven and earth! was this an action for the navy of Great Britain to pay costs in?

“ Yet,” says the P. A. “ when, notwithstanding this (namely, this extortion upon our part) Denmark joined other powers of the North, the late Ministers prepared an expedition.” What then? Why, then, “ the victory at Copenhagen is Mr. PITT’s”!! Can it be seriously expected of me to reason with an adversary like this?

Notwithstanding what, Sir? Had we not agreed to deliberate upon our right? had we not encouraged Denmark to pursue her pretensions? had we not crowned her insolence with success? But if fitting out an expedition be equivalent to conquering with it, why does not Mr. PITT add the victory of Ferrol to that of Copenhagen? But why would the victory be Mr. PITT’s? If any thing happens disastrous, every expedition is carefully assigned to other owners. Thus Lord ROSSLYN’s claims to Dunkirk, Mr. WINDHAM’s to Quiberon, Lord MELVILLE’s to Schagenbrugh, are firmly established; their title is undisputed, their tenure sacred, and their possession undisturbed by the concurrent right of any joint tenant, or tenant in common. But if there be a pretension to success (even the success of another Administration and of other Councils) it is all the exclusive property and fee simple of Mr. PITT!

This accession of Denmark, however, to the
Northern

Northern Powers, of them to Denmark, with the embargo laid by Paul I. upon all our commerce and seamen in his ports, was no small part of the prosperous and desireable succession of the new Ministers ; this was the favourable opportunity of the P. A. when we were “ to have in our hands the means of enforcing the final acquiescence of Denmark in our demands” !

A few words more, and I have done. Let the late Ministers beware of their dangerous counsel, and most critical defence ! Their flatterers are their worst accusers : they strike at their head with a golden axe, but a fatal and a sharp one ! What folly is it to talk of animosity in me ? I have defended them against the charge of concealing favourable circumstances from our army in Egypt already. Let them bethink them, how they might answer to the laws for thus truckling to such an enemy as Denmark, if the state of the country had been as prosperous and desireable, as Mr. CANNING thinks it !

Détestables flatteurs ! présent le plus funeste,
Que puisse faire aux grands la colére céleste.

Certainly, in their hands at least, this expedition also was hopeless, for what was the result of Admiral DICKSON’s expedition ? In the firmest, it was full of fear, full of anxiety and danger ! If victory was problematical, the fruits of it were more so. It did not follow that it should

lead to peace. The death of Paul the First was unforeseen; it surely was not one of those favourable circumstances which the late Ministers judged it necessary to conceal from our officers, for it had not happened when they retired. He was then breathing vengeance for his troops, the relics of North Holland, which a policy (more mad than any act of his) had refused to exchange against our French prisoners, and for Malta, of which we had shewn and withdrawn more than the hope to his burning imagination*.

It astonishes me that any man, pretending to the character of a statesman, should think that I have overcharged the picture of our position at the resignation. I am told, that Jacobinism was extinct. Is it extinct even now? But if it was so, why were the sedition acts prolonged? Why was the suspension of the *Habeas Corpus* conti-

* Had I entertained any design of exposing the conduct of the late Ministers, beyond what was necessarily implicated with the desire of doing justice to the cause I had undertaken, it is not probable that I should have omitted this topic! Sir CHARLES STUART (an ever honoured and lamented name) had actually received orders from Lord MELVILLE to admit a Russian garrison into Malta; which, rather than obey, that great officer (then greatest) threw up his command. The patriot and the statesman prevailed over the soldier's ardor, and the Empire was saved by his generous self-devotion. It is with sentiments very different from malevolence towards any man, that I refresh these laurels on his tomb.—They distil no poisons, and will flourish for ever green in the memory of Britons: while Malta is still the monument of his fame, and the bulwark of this country!

nued? If the Revenue overflowed, why was the repeal of the Income Tax bequeathed to other hands? Are not all these acts of delinquency, if the flatterers of that Ministry will deny the pressure of the time—if they take away the plea of hard imperious necessity*?

So much for the state of the country in February 1801; to which I might add the occupation of Hanover by the Prussians, of Hamburg by the Danes, with the shutting up of the Ems and Weser. I might add, that the militia had been cut up and ruined both in its constitution and its members; that the Admiralty, after denouncing three millions of annual peculation in the dock-yards, thought the period too gloomy and dangerous to undertake the reform it was pledged to; that it wanted courage to employ that most gallant and distinguished officer Sir JOHN COLPOYS, whose most hard and meritorious service was the title of his exclusion. But if the P. Answerer will still deny the causes of despondency which prevailed, and which nothing but utter ignorance could have defended the Ministers from feeling in common with all who knew them, he must be left to his

* The scarcity had not disappeared. The measures of government had been ill-taken, and had caused discontent and distrust. We owed millions upon the Continent for corn, which were to be provided for by the weak and incapable men who were to refuse to the Roman Catholics of Ireland the boon which Mr. PITT dared not.

most wilful perversity. To every man besides, I appeal, whether the sketch, so rapidly and imperfectly drawn in the C. R. does not bear the marks of mercy towards the late Administration?

I do therefore think, I could not have better expressed by any other word than *confutation*, the state of the public sentiment, when to all this complicated predicament of evil and despondency was superadded, the sudden resignation of the King's Ministers, and that too upon a pretext which the public utterly discredited, and accompanied with circumstances which malevolence might easily confound with a breach both of oath and duty; I mean the publication of the private opinion of His Majesty in Council, and the inflammatory tendency of the paper delivered by the Irish Government, in the name of Mr. **PITT**, to Dr. **TROY**, the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin.

It was my intention to have discussed this part of the subject at length, in order to shew that the Catholic question was a mere pretext, a most weak, dangerous, and wicked pretext to disguise the true motive of the resignation. I should have shewn that no promise was made to the Catholics even by Mr. **PITT** himself; that this measure required a dispensation, which no earthly power could confer, of his Majesty's coronation oath; that not more than *thirty* individuals in the kingdom of Ireland

Ireland could, by any near contingency, derive advantage from it; that it must have been followed by repealing all the test acts; that it militated against all Mr. PITT's public engagements, acts, and character; that had it been sincere, it was not urgent; had it been urgent, it had been neglected, and finally forgotten, when he was treating for the resumption of the very office which he had resigned, because "his honour and his conscience" would not permit him to retain it without proposing this very measure. This was my intention, but I forbear—every sentiment of duty and honour prescribes to forbear from the agitation of a subject, which ought never to have been moved, and which will always be followed by more than one kind of calamity; I shall only repeat, that it is extremely difficult to reconcile the paper in question to the third article of the oath of a Privy Counsellor, in which he *swears to keep the King's counsel secret* *. And that, as far as I am able to observe, the paper alluded to was not *distinctly and unreservedly* admitted by Mr. PITT, in the debate of the 25th of March, 1801.†

As to the assertion of the P. A. that there were "circumstances attending the Catholic discussion in the closet, which, if they had arisen upon any

* Vide Blackstone, vol. I. title Privy Counsellor.

† Mr. PITT seems upon the Catholic question to have attended to the celebrated advice of one of the Pope's Legates,

"Bisogna infurinarfi di Teologia, et far un fonda di Politica."

other question, would have produced the resignations"*, it seems very much to diminish the importance of the measure itself, and to render very doubtful the necessity of assigning it as the cause of the retreat of the Ministers to the public, and to the titular Archbishop in particular. These *circumstances* evidently designate the opposition made to Mr. PITT's will in the highest quarter, which was no secret before the King opened the Session; and they seem to be alledged, in this place, to apologize for Mr. PITT's intended return to office without bringing forward the Catholic question.

Upon the next topic, I shall now merely remark, that if "Mr. PITT really made a distinct offer to remain in power until peace, and until the most pressing difficulties of the country should be removed; provided he could be assured that no attempt should be made, in the mean time, to prejudge the Catholic question, †" it seems a very superfluous precaution.—Could he not trust *his own* security? Remaining in office, who could prejudge it but *himself*?—Of this offer, I have never conversed with any person who had the slightest suspicion. I have reason to believe that the fact is utterly unknown to those who must have been acquainted with it. The internal evidence is strongly against it; and I cannot consider it as true, as it would throw the whole weight of Mr. PITT's evidence

* P. 8.

† P. A. p. 17.

into

into the scale opposite to Mr. CANNING, and his “desireable succession.”

The public however now knows less from Mr. PIT_T, of the real causes of the resignation, than it did before, inasmuch as less importance is attributed to its ostensible motive! And as to the *circumstances* which attended the discussions, and which, whatever had been the subject of discussion, would have produced exactly the same result, they are for that reason not worth its enquiry. The servant who gives no reason for leaving his place, but that “he had some words with his master,” gives his own character. Is it nothing whether these words *happened* in the midst of a journey, or of illness, or distress? whether they arose out of accident or design? whether upon a just cause or a bad one? whether urgent or voluntary? I tremble when I consider who the Master of this servant is, and that this servant scorns to return *as an accession* to his family! and that there has been an evident design to force him back there, without his confidence and without his consent!—It is rather remarkable, that the P. A. should conclude this little *circumstantial* romance, with an observation, that “these *facts* need no comment:”—if they were facts they would require no comment indeed!

Now as to the accession of Mr. ADDINGTON and his colleagues, I shall merely repeat, in order that my silence may not be misconstrued, that

that they did obey the King's commands, and their own sense of duty. That they owed their appointments to no other quarter, and to no intrigue, or ambition. I re-assert that the public sentiment gave them credit for courage, and self-devotedness, in assuming the helm of the public vessel, so cruelly abandoned.—For less the Roman Commonwealth decreed the thanks of the State to an odious, an unfortunate, and a culpable commander, and in circumstances not more deserving of gratitude, they erected a temple *Jovi *flatori**.

It is impossible for me to scrutinize their hearts, and to find what share ambition had in their zeal,—but the ambition of saving their country, and bringing the deserted vessel into port, they will probably not wish very anxiously to disclaim. The King had been for some time distressed by the conduct of the late Ministers, and the resignations had “perplexed him in the extreme.” I believe in my conscience, they wanted no other motive, and no other call! But there were considerations both of delicacy and prudence, that led Mr. ADDINGTON in particular, to consult the feelings, to ascertain the wishes, and secure the support of Mr. PITT; I mean public and private confidence, and friendship, the friendship of their whole lives!—I leave my Lord GRENVILLE, for the present, out of the question.—The public has done his Lordship justice, and scarcely the P. A. dares *insinuate* his defence.

That

That Mr. PITT limited and confined *his* promise of support to *three* conditions, I have every reason to believe, to be without the smallest foundation in truth.* Let him say, if they existed, what they were, openly, candidly, and manfully!—I have no light reason to affirm—I would not dare to affirm upon light reason—that they were never heard of where they must have been known, till they appeared in the midst of his *pièces justificatives*, in the Plain Answerer.

Mr. PITT was (I hope) delighted that His Majesty had found a cabinet, and such a cabinet as he himself could inaugurate by the most just, as well as the warmest panegyric. Was it for him to stipulate three mysterious conditions of support, whose feelings for the public pressure and distress had induced him to make the offer of remaining (if you will credit his apologist) “until peace, and the delivery of the country from its most pressing burthens”? Was this a time “to impose conditions upon Ministers of State, too hard to be borne”? to fetter them with bonds, and tie them to penalties?

Let us suppose for a moment, that he had not resigned in the spirit of resignation, as certainly it cannot be said

“THAT HIS LAST CARE WAS DECENTLY TO DIE.”

That the address to the Irish Catholics, was a postern left open for his forcible return; all that ap-

* P. A. p. 20.

peared,

peared, and all that lurked, let us suspect or admit it all—still he wanted, he had occasion, he had absolute necessity, for a successor even for a moment. Whatever Mr. CANNING thought, his fame had been for ever blasted, and his chance of power had perished for ever with it, if he had left the King naked in the storm. Had Mr. ADDINGTON declined the confidence His Majesty was pleased to offer him, what had been Mr. PITT's case? would he not have felt himself obliged once more *to offer to remain* until the cloud had fallen? or would he have had his Master throw himself upon the demi-Jacobin Opposition of Mr. FOX, and beg support of prudential revolt, and the majesty of the people? Where had been the King, and where the State, if Mr. ADDINGTON had declined? But was it nothing for Mr. PITT that, without exception, every one of his own partizans, pupils, and dependants, (that were so disposed) retained his situation? That he did not lose a friend by falling from his pre-eminence? For those who piqued themselves upon that title (*par excellence*) were they who followed him in his retreat, and who would not conceal for a moment their indignation and disappointment, that the King had been extricated from the scylla of the Catholic question, and the charybdis of Parliamentary reform, with all the monstrous progeny of Mr. FOX's improvements upon the constitution of our ancestors!

I say, I hope Mr. PITT was really delighted; but certain it is that if he appeared so, Mr. CANNING, and his other dependants, did not give him full credit for sincerity. Their *sagacity* thought they penetrated deeper into his interests and wishes; and as there could be no doubt, but that they understood and studied the wishes of their Patron, the public was very justifiable in coupling their conduct with the address to the Catholics, and inferring from both that it was not altogether agreeable to the resigners, that His Majesty had been able to supply their place with a fit and efficient Administration!

The whole reasoning of the Plain Answerer, and the Member of Parliament, upon the conduct of Mr. CANNING, proceeds upon false grounds, and its only chance of ending in truth, therefore, is the defect of their logic. Mr. CANNING's opposition has nothing to do with Lord GRENVILLE, or *the Borough of Tratee in Ireland*, or peace or war, or volunteers, or finance. It began while he *sate* for a good English Government Borough—before Mr. ADDINGTON had committed a single fault in the eyes of his constant, active, and zealous supporters, or obtained the smallest credit from experience with the public. The *corpus delicti* was obedience to the King. His presumption preceded his incapacity; his crime was not being a bad Minister, but daring to be a Minister at all. It began while Mr.

PITT

PITT was pronouncing his panegyric in the House of Commons, while Lord CHATHAM was introducing him into the Cabinet, while the King was delivering the seals to him.— Well may Mr. CANNING cry out, “ men not measures ;” but it is a heavy charge preferred against him by the P. A. that his conduct gave “ great dissatisfaction” to Mr. PITT. I am certain it was far from Mr. CANNING’s intention ! This ingratitude never entered into his thought, nor that he would one day be reproached with it by Mr. PITT and his dependants ! He may well resent the alledged “ disapprobation” of Mr. PITT, he may well deny that Mr. PITT was “ dissatisfied” with his zeal ! Indeed the accusation against him is contemptible ; did Mr. PITT ever express disapprobation *aloud*, did he ever *disown* him ? This surely he would have done if he had been *dissatisfied*.—He who pleases to think that the Chancellor of the Exchequer could controul my thoughts, and that his disapprobation of them is insufficient !

Mr. CANNING threw up the most ostensible of his offices, rather than hold it from the man who had the presumption to fill the place of his Patron. Did Mr. PITT disapprove of that ?

Did Mr. PITT disapprove of his retaining another place, worth six hundred pounds a year, dependent on the pleasure of the presumptuous person, against whom he was daily declaiming in epigrams,

grams, and caballing in rhyme? What pretence for disapprobation? What demand for apology? Could a volatile epigram *keep* like an impeachment; and wit be bottled like ambition and malice, for distant use? Or did it require any apology to remain in the ALIENATION-OFFICE, of which no man could more happily discharge the obligations and duties, as Mr. PITT and the Chancellor of the Exchequer have equal reason to be satisfied!

I know, indeed, that to some weak minds the honest zeal of Mr. CANNING has appeared officious and parasitical. They think Lord CHATHAM nearer in blood, was as much alive in honour to resent it, if the acceptance of Mr. ADDINGTON had been in any shape blameable or presumptuous. They think his Lordship would not have made part of a Cabinet, which any of Mr. PITT's friends could be justified in condemning *a priori*, and they are satisfied that his Lordship gave full credit to Mr. PITT's promise, professions, and panegyric, and that Mr. CANNING ought to have done so. If his conduct was right they ask what was Lord CHATHAM's, and if Lord CHATHAM's were to blame, what necessity existed for Mr. CANNING in particular being the foremost to expose and contrast it?

Mr. PITT, it appears, formed the same judgment of this conduct. " *He was dissatisfied with it,*

*it, he disapproved highly of it.**" He had certainly a better right to do so than myself, but I am proud of the high authority which defends me from any imputation of error, in this instance. Still I am not sure whether it be true, as the P. A. asserts, that "nothing but creating an irreconcileable enmity between Mr. CANNING and Mr. PITT, could convince Mr. ADDINGTON's friends of the sincerity of the last mentioned Gentleman." Whether he enjoys all this importance or not, in the minds of Mr. ADDINGTON's friends, as a Near Observer I must be permitted to doubt. I conceive that epigrams are not mortal weapons, though their point may be dipped in the most rancorous gall—and as to the parliamentary conduct of the Right. Hon. Gentleman, I apprehend that those who give it most consequence, connect it with his connection with Mr. PITT.

We are informed, however, that the dissatisfaction was *mutual*, and that Mr. CANNING disapproved, as much as Mr. PITT was dissatisfied; but of what did *he* disapprove? If the time was halcyon, prosperous and serene, surely it was lawful for any Minister, weary of power, and sick of importance, to lay down the burthen; nor was it presumptuous, not at least very presumptuous, in another to essay the yoke.

* P. A. p. 43.

Neither

Neither ought I or any man to be blamed for our *mistake* in inferring, that these friends were upon happier terms. Who could guess that they walked or rode together to quarrel? who could suppose that they visited and eat and drank together, to express *mutual dissatisfaction* and *disapprobation*?

From these Lapithean feasts, and social broils I should naturally turn to the great Automachist Mr. WINDHAM, and to those battles only worse than the strife of friends, which he is eternally waging with himself. But I am obliged to postpone him, not out of any disrespect, but in order to pursue without interruption, that arrangement which I originally proposed, and which has been followed by others.

It is beneath my care to expose all the *civil* and *chicanery*, which have been opposed to the statement of the "Cursory Remarks," with respect to the *specific* terms of the promise of "CONSTANT, ACTIVE, AND ZEALOUS SUPPORT." It is acknowledged that Lord GRENVILLE repeated the words in the House of Lords, and the Plain Answerer pretends, that the promise upon Mr. PITT's part, was not only specific, but that he guarded it with a triple hedge of precaution and security. I do indeed think it my duty to protest against this circumstance in the statement, but

but this will not invalidate the admission of Mr: **PITT**'s counsel, that a specific pledge was actually given.

This I insist upon only for my own justification, for it is of little consequence, among men of honour, whether an engagement be formal or implied; Mr. **PITT**'s panegyric was itself a promise of support.

As to the evasive and litigious propositions of the P. A. and others, upon unqualified and unconditional promises, "let the conduct of the new Ministers be what it would*", they are wholly out of the question, and their learning is unapplicable and pedantic. There is not an expression in the C. R. which can be tortured into a desire to hold Mr. **PITT** and Lord **GRENVILLE** to the letter of their engagement, or to claim more than its fair and liberal construction. That interpretation I still contend for; I consider them as engaged by their promise, and solemnly pledged as men of honour, and as men, for a sincere disposition and intention, to give general support; friendship, and assistance.

One of the gentlemen refers me to **TULLY**'s Offices for some cases, where it is laid down that "*his promissi starit*," is unnecessary. I am sorry to see the casuistry of Republican Rome

* P. 19.

thus

thus ransacked for a defence of modern virtuality, and I fear there are other axioms which have not escaped the ingenious researches of these moral antiquarians, such as “*multa non facturi pròmittimus*,” and “*vir bonus potest malam causam defendere*.”

MACHIAVEL, if they will pardon any attempt of mine to assist their *studies*, has a chapter “upon the manner in which great men ought to observe their promises.” It is called by a celebrated critic “a portentous chapter!”—How unfortunate that time has devoured that extraordinary discourse which was pronounced before CATO the Censor, by CARNEADES—*contra justitiam!* It might have justified all their patrons have lately done, and all that they have written.

For my part, I cannot cancel these promises, as

“Vows made in pain, and violent and void.”

It is not pretended that any fraud or delusion was practised to obtain them, the P. A. denies that they were made under the influence of fear, and they contained nothing unlawful or immoral in themselves. It remains therefore that his adversaries shew how Mr. ADDINGTON has broken the condition, and forfeited his right. This the Plain Answerer has attempted to prove; and in order to do so, he has carefully distinguished the case of his two clients.

For Lord GRENVILLE he pleads, that “ his Lordship looked upon the terms of the treaties by which the war had been concluded, and the manner in which they had been negotiated, and *several other measures* which took place *at the same time*, not only as a departure from the principles upon which he had offered his support, but as affording a proof of the incapacity of Ministers sufficient to authorize and require a systematic opposition ;” and this he considers “ as the public principle upon which his Lordship acted.”*

Unfortunately for the P. A. his Lordship has taken the greatest care to shew the falsehood of this defence. It was upon the very day † Mr. ADDINGTON entered the Cabinet as first Minister, that he recorded in Parliament his pledge of ACTIVE, CONSTANT, AND ZEALOUS SUPPORT ; but *before* any of these treaties were concluded, he appeared in decisive hostility and opposition to his new *protégés*, particularly upon the subject of the Convention with Russia. The French negotiations therefore were not the principle of his *systematic* opposition. And even upon the preliminary treaty, so far from avowing the *constructive* cause for systematic opposition, in the “ various measures which took place *at the same time* to justify and require it,” his Lordship was

* P. 21.

† March 20, 1801.

careful

careful to declare, in so many words, that “ his opposition was *not systematical*”!! He was mindful of his late engagements, and was attentive to shew that the immediate act of opposition was a mere occasional deviation, “ not general,” an exception, not a system; and in proof of it, so late as October 30th and November 3d, 1801, he re-covenanted with the Ministers in the House of Lords, “ to be found their MOST ZEALOUS AND STRENUOUS SUPPORTER,” expressing “ every kind of personal respect for the new Ministers, although he differed from them decidedly in *this instance*.”

Had his Lordship observed this new covenant, I am certain Ministers would never have preferred any violent complaint against his former infraction. They would have given him credit (however difficult) for a serious disapprobation of the treaty of the 5th June. But all these reserves and qualifications quickly died out of his Lordship’s opposition, and it became *systematical* as soon as he thought proper to *claim* the government of the country as the exclusive due of Mr. PITT†.

The

* P. Regist. Oct. 3, and Nov. 1801.

† One sees exemplified in Lord GRENVILLE’s opposition the axiom of the satyr, and the remark of the historian, the first says “ *Nemo repente fuit turpissimus*;” the other observes

The pleadings for Mr. PITT are far different, but not so wide asunder as their case; for Mr. PITT, so far from finding in the treaties and the *many measures* which took place at the same time, the motive or necessity for a systematic opposition, was their strenuous supporter! their warmest advocate and friend! It is curious to see the P. Answerer doubting, denying, or sneering at the merit of this Peace which his patron applauded to the skies; but it is something worse than I will characterize, for him to attempt, in the face of truth and of the public, to make it be believed that the approbation of Mr. PITT was accompanied with reserves and modifications*. I appeal to the memory of every Member of the House, if the Right Hon. Gentleman was not far, very far, from tempering or *qualifying* his support upon this occasion.—I firmly deny it; it is a negative that can be proved. Perhaps he was rather anxious to share its popularity, perhaps he was not displeased at being thought to have *previously* approved of it.—The bad faith of the P. A. is hardly more conspicuous in any instance than in this!

The P. A. says, Mr. PITT's opposition is *not systematic*. “He has not commenced a sys-

“Labente paulatim disciplinâ velut desidentes primo mores, deinde ut majis majisque lapsi sint, tum ire cæperint præcipites.” They did not tumble headlong till their confluence with Mr. PITT's opposition.

* P. A. p. 5.

matic

matic opposition." This is extraordinary, because his famous "order of the day" has all the appearance of concert, and tallies exactly with the same motion upon the same subject by Lord MULGRAVE in the House of Peers. It is entertaining, however, to hear the advocate of the Right Hon. Gentleman declare he has not *commenced*, who has impeached. Who, with more than epic licence has not only rushed into the middle, but to the end and consummation of all possible opposition! The political Cid may well exclaim—

"Mes pareils à deux fois ne se font point connaître,
Et pour leurs premiers coups ils veulent des coups de maître."

It appears, however, according to the P. A. that so far from being systematical, Mr. PITT's opposition is all "tenderness" and affection; his absence from Parliament arose out of "tenderness" to Mr. ADDINGTON; and his motion for the order of the day was founded upon his having "considered Mr. PATTEN's motion as more severe than the occasion justified; and because he thought it peculiarly repugnant to the interests of the nation to countenance a measure, the object of which was to force the Ministers from His Majesty's Councils*."

I do not know that the spirit which pervades every page of this writer breaks out any where else with more audacity, than in this solemn

* P. 53.

mockery

mockery and defiance of the common understanding and feeling of the public. I appeal to the plain conscience of every Member of the House, whether moving the order of the day upon a question of impeachment be not to *coun-tenance* it? If it be not virtually to admit and confess the justice of the original motion, and to dispute nothing but the fitness of the time? If its operation could be any thing else than to give time to Ministers to avoid the effect of the first motion by retiring from their offices? I put it to the honour of every Gentleman who shall read these pages, whether Mr. PITT's motion would not have been as effectual as Mr. PATTEN's, (if it had been carried) to *force the Ministers from His Majesty's Councils*? Whether they could have executed the duties of their offices, with an impeachment suspended over their head only by the slight thread of a previous question?

Had Mr. PITT's motion been carried, it is obvious that Mr. ADDINGTON had but this election, either to *make haste* and lay his seals at His Majesty's feet, or to advise him to dissolve his Parliament!! So much for the "tenderness" of Mr. PITT, and for the truth, candour, and delicacy of his justification!

As nothing could be more hostile than this order of the day, nothing is more probable than that Mr. CANNING himself would have been as well contented to carry it as the proposition of Mr.

Mr. PATTEN, if he had not been pledged to that Great Man at the first concoction of his motion.

The pleas for this “tender” “unsystematical” opposition are various. Inattention upon the part of Ministers to certain hints of Mr. PITT; disapprobation expressed by that Gentleman both of the conduct of affairs abroad, and of the financial statement of the 10th of December; and, finally, the violation of two of the *three* magical and invisible conditions!

I own I consider this last cause as the true justification of all Mr. PITT’s “tenderness” to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and lament the more that they are out of my knowledge and my reach. They are probably of the nature of those dictated to poor CINDERELLA in the *History*, as Mr. ADDINGTON’s penalty was to be similar to her’s, who was despoiled of her finery, and driven home from the ball in misery and disgrace, for *having forgotten the hour at which she was appointed to retire!*

Of the *hints* insinuated to have been given to Mr. ADDINGTON, no enemy of Mr. PITT’s could be anxious to express a doubt. As a matter of fact, however, it is incumbent upon me to controvert this statement;—as a Near Observer, it must be forgiven me if I alledge, with some confidence, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had received no intimation of any difference of opinion excepting upon the accuracy of the financial statement.

statement. And what reason had he to suppose this difference was *hostile*?

Of Mr. PITT's disapprobation of the mode of conducting the negotiations with France, he was also uninformed; it is indeed difficult to conceive upon what grounds Mr. PITT could have disapproved them, as the papers were not published till *after* the negotiation for his return to power!! The P. A. asserts, however, that Mr. ADDINGTON was "*distinctly* informed before this period that Mr. PITT disapproved of some of the leading measures of his government*." If he would be believed upon this head, he must say *through what channel*. I have the strongest reasons for thinking that he is totally——*mistaken*.

It would appear from the P. A. that there were *two* distinct propositions, at different times, made to his principal. This too I am of opinion is a——*mistake*.

One of them is said to have been "too foolish, too insulting to be noticed." — I would be glad to know *who* carried such an overture to Mr. PITT? I know but of one negotiation; and I have already stated what particulars of it I was able to do with certainty and prudence. There is neither the love of decency nor of honour in the contradictions to that statement. I am accused of misrepresentation and calumny—for what? only to have the truth of all my positions established by an unwilling and a virulent enemy.—The *fine qua*

* P. 24.

nor of Lord GRENVILLE's admission is preposterously denied and admitted, nor is there in his own exposition the smallest tittle of variation from my *calumnious* account, but what is calculated to place Mr. PITT in a more disadvantageous and unfavourable light*.

It is indeed roundly asserted, that the negotiation was not Mr. PITT's; that it originated with Mr. ADDINGTON himself. I certainly think differently; I have distinctly stated that it began with Lord MELVILLE†, and I have attributed all fairness and candour to that noble Lord, even regret for the extravagant proposition of Mr. PITT upon which it broke off. I cannot, however, induce the public to believe that Mr. PITT had no knowledge of what was passing, and that his Lordship had neglected to ascertain *his* disposition towards a return to office. I do not suspect him of having *surprized* Mr. PITT with any foolish and insulting overtures from the Treasury, or having been so bad or so faithless a mediator, as not to have explored the wishes and disposition of *both* parties. It is with the fatality that attends all the arguments of the P. A. that he insists upon the proposal having originated in the breast of Mr. ADDINGTON, as we shall presently see him wisely insinuating that this Minister has endeavoured, by artifice and misrepresentation, to keep Mr. PITT *from* His Majesty's confidence and favour!

* P. A. p. 25.

† C. R. p. 44.

I am

I am not really able to perceive in what the statement of the P. A. differs essentially from my own, except in an officious and affected use of a name too great to be mentioned, and a great deal of solemn nonsense about a message which I have perhaps committed myself already in saying, that it would not have been wanting, if Mr. PITT could have been induced to depart from his *fine quâ non*. It appears that his object is to perplex and embarrass with the delicacy of this high allusion.

Upon his return from Scotland, and *very* soon after it, *I have always understood* that Lord MELVILLE waited upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and having taken occasion to express that he thought it very desirable in the then circumstances of the country, that it should have the benefit of Mr. PITT's abilities as a Minister, his Lordship knows that he found nothing but alacrity to acknowledge the accuracy, and concur to the object of his observation. Whether this were the *first* political visit his Lordship paid *any where*, I have no certain knowledge; but I think and know so well of him, as that he would not have broached so critical a business without some kind of certainty that it was not disagreeable to Mr. PITT. Mr. ADDINGTON certainly must have viewed the overture in this light; he knew that Lord MELVILLE was far more intimately connected with Mr. PITT than with himself;

self: it would have been absurd in him to have supposed that the subject was opened in this quarter, if, as the P. Answerer pretends, Mr. PITT had not felt "a sufficient desire to return to office," and if the miscarriage of the negotiation would have been "a relief" to him. The very opinion of Lord MELVILLE that it would succeed, was under all circumstances no contemptible assurance of its success.

Nor is it to be conceived, that after the friendly discussions which must have taken place before formal offers were arranged, that noble Lord, with all his knowledge and experience, could have been the bearer of any proposals to which he thought Mr. PITT *might* not have consented. The extent of Mr. ADDINGTON's concessions is not controverted. Whether wisely or not, certainly most honourably, most disinterestedly, he yielded *far beyond the point of equality*: he would have descended from his station: he would have admitted, with the exception of the points in which his personal feeling and character were involved, every nomination of Mr. PITT, and an undoubted majority of *his* voices in the Cabinet. All this is conceded; but it was expected of him, at least demanded, to recommend to His Majesty the re-appointment of Lord GRENVILLE. I have no hesitation to assert that he would have been dishonoured if he had submitted, and that Mr. PITT must have felt that he would be so. There might surely be still other reasons,

reasons, and honest convictions, which might induce an honourable Minister not to commit the Sovereign upon such an occasion. He might possibly have *known* that such a recommendation could not have *succeeded*. The example of the Catholic paper is not good, for the Royal Person can never be innocently denounced by his First Minister to the disappointed as the cause of their mortification!

It is certain that Mr. PITT insisted upon this proposal being carried to the Throne: * whether he thought the return of war and its embarrassments favourable to extravagant demands, or that he was pledged upon this point to Lord GRENVILLE, it is certain also, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer declined, and that the negotiation was broken off upon this point, and no other. Now mark the P. A. whose object is to hold the pretensions of Mr. PITT a little higher, I think, than becomes a subject. He would insinuate, that the Right Hon. Gentleman refused to negotiate except with the King. "His Majesty," says he, "was not advised to send to Mr. PITT, and the proposition fell to the ground."

How could he have missed so narrowly the truth, and have avoided to state *that the proposition fell to the ground, and His Majesty was not advised to send?*

* How does this agree with the meek offer of "remaining till peace, and the relief of the country from its most pressing burthens?"

But

But to admit every word of the statement of the P. A. who can discover the “*dictation* of Mr. ADDINGTON?” who can believe that he was abusing the meek spirit of Mr. PITT, and imposing terms upon him incompatible with *his* honour or the justice of *his* pretensions? What a portrait have we here of the Right Hon. Gentleman! He cannot controul Mr. CANNING—Mr. ADDINGTON dictates terms to him—and all this while he is setting a price upon his services, which would weigh down the honour and the independence of the Crown! I think this charge of *dictation* against the Chancellor of the Exchequer may serve as a commentary upon that of malice against myself.—Both accusations become Mr. PITT, as moderation, justice, and humanity, the lips of BONAPARTE!

The P. A. seems aware that the public is not likely to consider this *dictation* as being justly placed on Mr. ADDINGTON’s side of the account. He therefore contends for the right of Mr. PITT’s private judgment, and free-will. I am not disposed to contest it, although I think if the right is with him, the censure is with the public. But it is impossible to pass over the extraordinary apostrophe of his advocate upon this occasion. “Surely,” says he, “it was for him to appreciate the talents and qualifications of those with whom he was to risk his character, and to consider upon what terms he was to return to office

office consistently with his own credit and the public interest, none can question his right to determine upon this point for himself.*”

Well, Sir!—but some may question his discretion, his temper, and his patriotism—some may think he had appreciated their talents and qualifications in 1801, and that if he could embark at that perilous hour upon their bottom, without a scruple, all the treasure and safety of the state; he might, in 1803, have risked the remains of his own character and credit with them, without so much affected delicacy and precaution.—Some may think that he had no odds of talent or of character to stake against Mr. ADDINGTON, Lord ELDON, Lord St. VINCENT, and other Members of the Administration; and all must be perplexed to account by what means a Government which he had declared to be fully competent *without* himself, could instantly become incompetent, unsafe, and precarious, if he became an accession to it!

As to the parliamentary conduct of the Right Hon. Gentleman *since* the motion of Mr. PATTEN, I must be excused if I do not think it of quite so much importance as the Plain Answerer. As a leader of opposition, Mr. PITT, in my judgment, will never be so formidable, as from his great eloquence, and the party with which seventeen years of patronage have surrounded him,

* P. A. p. 29.

might

might perhaps be expected. I will not suppose that he does not, as a mere politician, repent of his "contemptible motion of order," (I use the words of one of my opponents) although his advocate has the indecency to attribute the decision of the House to "inflamed passion."* Mr. PITT knows, that no anonymous misrepresentations and calumnies can be so prejudicial to his pretensions as this motion, which will witness for ever against him in the Journals of the House of Commons. This Jacobin jargon of the P. Answerer is beneath even contempt—his abuse of the House of Commons is borrowed from the worst language of the worst times of the worst oppositions, and is the more calumnious and impudent, as no man ever, till lately, contended more for the infallibility and impeccability of majorities than his own patron.

I shall, however, say a few words upon the conduct of that Right Hon. Gentleman upon the discussion of the property-tax†, because the P. Answerer, under the pretence of correcting my errors, has published the most deliberate libel upon another majority of the House of Commons.

I very willingly admit that the account given of this matter in the C. R. is not perfect as a report of parliamentary proceedings. They were indeed published a few days after this discussion, and some inaccuracy might perhaps be pardoned to

* P. A. p. 56.

† July 15, 1803.

the

the eagerness and exertion which were required to bring them out before the separation of Parliament. My statement however was *sufficiently* correct, as it was only given to shew the deference of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for Mr. PITT's authority, when he could not be convinced by his arguments; and the prejudicial consequences to the revenue of that Gentleman's interference: in neither of which instances has the P. A. thought proper to contradict me. I shall not now descend into a financial dispute with him. I desire to know what excuse he can offer, after six months leisure, and the virulent accuser of my haste and inaccuracy, for his own studied and deliberate misrepresentation—what apology he will submit to the House for the following most false and wilful mistatement and calumny?—

“ One hundred and fifty Members of Parliament voted against Mr. PITT's proposal on the 13th of July, and on the 14th resigned their opinions without giving a single reason for the change.” “ They lifted their voice in favour of the question on one day, and were willing to declare against it without a murmur on the next.”*

Now, whoever will take the trouble of referring to the Journals of the House on the debates of that day and the next will find, that there is not *one word of truth* in this statement, coming from un-

* P. A. p. 62.

der

der the eye of the Ex-chancellor of the Exchequer, and the pen of the *corrector* of misrepresentations and calumnies.

Upon the first day Mr. Pitt moved, "that it be an instruction to the Committee to receive a clause," &c. &c. Against this proposal, it was contended, that if the instruction were voted, it would be mandatory upon the Committee, who would thus be fettered in their deliberations, and the question pre-judged; the Speaker too declared, that it was against the usages of the House. In these opinions a majority concurred of 150 against 50.

It could not have escaped this most Accurate Observer, that the House decided upon a *mere question of order*, and that the motive for the opinion of the majority was not opposition to the matter but to the mode of Mr. Pitt's proposal. They desired only to conform to the usages of the House, as declared by the Speaker, and to go unfettered into the Committee. They thought, and the Speaker had declared the instruction to be either imperative or unnecessary.

Now, is it possible for any man who has regard even for the remnant of his reputation, and the memory of his better fame, to pretend, that these hundred and fifty Gentlemen rose pledged to vote one way or other upon the principle, by the part they had taken in the division upon this motion of order? Can Mr. Pitt contend, that they

who expressly demanded to go free into the Committee, by that demand had bound themselves, and came into it engaged? Upon the next day the clause was certainly voted in the Committee; but what excuse is there for calumniating this Committee for having adopted it, because it was free to reject it, or the majority of the House, for having defended their usages? Can any thing prove the truth of the Speaker's observation, that the instruction was unnecessary, more than the actual adoption of the clause without the instruction? I will not ask the P. Answerer to blush upon this occasion, for he has seen Pharsalia, but I trust he will never again appear before the public as a corrector of calumnies and misrepresentations!

I must take this opportunity of observing, that notwithstanding all that was said by Mr. PITT upon this occasion in the House, (and that is repeated by the P. A.) I can assert with confidence, that it is not true, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had received the smalleſt intimation of his intention to oppose any part of the Bill upon the ground of a *violation of public faith*, until the very morning of the debate. I could attest the honourable and learned gentleman who carried this information; but as a Near Observer, I think myself capable of bearing witness that this grand manœuvre lost nothing of its effect by any previous

vious preparation ; I can assure him that the surprize was complete !

Before I follow the P. A. in the general view he has taken of the measures of Government, I think it proper to vindicate myself against the charge of inconsistency which he has brought against me for having said, that I had no reason to doubt but that the public would be well satisfied if Mr. PITT would accept a seat in the Cabinet ; and that nothing would give me individually more satisfaction than to hear him firmly and zealously giving his support to the King's servants. It is not true that I have stated the Right Hon. Gentleman to possess nothing but " the mere gift of eloquence," I have not been backward to acknowledge " his great financial abilities," and his " still great influence" in the country ; although I have not, and could not have avoided the disagreeable office of shewing how unfortunately for his country, his eloquence, his financial skill, and his influence have been employed since the failure of the negotiation for his return to office. Does any man think that if that negotiation had taken another turn I should have had these complaints to prefer, or that Mr. PATTEN's motion might not have been *conscientiously* negatived even by Mr. CANNING himself ?

But if Mr. PITT would have really dishonoured himself by becoming *an accession* to Mr. ADDING-

TON's Administration, how will that great logician, the Plain Answerer, prove it inconsistent with malevolence to desire it?

Certainly, if it be malice and animosity towards Mr. PITT, not to wish to see him in the chief place, I am guilty of it; and as certainly, if there be nothing hostile in desiring that he should occupy that situation for which his talents are adopted, I am free of this censure. No man has better justified than he, the famous observation, that

Tel brille au second rang qui s'éclipse au premier.
That he neither understood the state of Europe, nor the nature of the French Revolution, is a part of history; that his original error infected the whole character of the war, and made its whole conduct, to use an expression of Mr. BURKE's, *one error*, cannot be doubted by any man, who would wish to pass for a Statesman or even an observer of events; that he is a most able financier and a most eloquent Senator, is, I think, conceded by all parties. Is this no reputation—no distinction, or advantage? I think it is his flatterer who is his enemy, and not I; for I would have him where he is certain to shine, and to shine amongst the highest; but he would place him again where he and half mankind have eternal reason to regret that he has ever ascended.

Neither is it altogether unfriendly, that any one

one should wish, (after what has taken place,) to see him out of all danger of being absorbed in those cryptogamic coalitions, of which I observed the first signs on the 9th of Dec. 1803. He had surely better shine even a secondary star in the vault of power, than become even the brightest pebble of that confused Mosaick patchwork of parties, which he sees upon the floor opposite to him in the House of Commons.

I will now distinctly satisfy the Plain Answerer, how, without either malice or inconsistency, it is possible for me to regret that Mr. PITT was not pleased to accept a seat in Mr. ADDINGTON's Administration. I am firmly persuaded (unjustly if the P. A. pleases; but I am firmly persuaded) that there is no *mezzo termine* between his support and his hostility to Government, and (as I prefer open manly opposition to his insidious motions of order, and had rather he would coalesce with *one* than co-operate with *all* the oppositions,) I must say, no election between his assistance and the very worst species of hostility. There are specks in our horizon which teach every wise man to prepare for more storms than one. Be absent every unjust and unworthy thought, while I say, that never yet did our duty to our Country, our Sovereign, and our God, so imperiously command to watch over our afflicted state, to protect its integrity, to fight against evils from abroad and from home, from the malice of man, and the dis-
pensations

pensions of Heaven! Shall it not be lawful to invoke unanimity at such an hour, to deprecate every species of distraction? May I not desire the eloquence of the Right Hon. Gentleman upon the side of Government, to defend the prerogatives of his Master, and the sacred limits of the Constitution?

It has been objected, by a great and impartial judge, to the Right Hon. Gentleman, "that *power* not fame was the principle of his ambition."* I confess myself to have always been of this opinion, which his conduct since his resignation has made evident to the most distant and the dullest observation. Power then I would give him, but not the power to impress again his individual character and temper upon our public councils; I would assign him a department, but not the state—these are my wishes, but I acknowledge as a part of my own liberty the free prerogative of the Crown, to place him and every other of its subjects in that situation where his virtues or abilities may be most useful to the state. I say of my own liberty, for I would have it clearly and distinctly understood, that if my Lord GRENVILLE, or any other family of better pretensions, could succeed in dictating to the Sovereign the choice of his Ministers, the liberty of the subject would be as completely overwhelmed as the privilege of the King. It is our right, and

* Pursuits of Literature, p. 84, 5th Edit.

at this moment perhaps the most valuable of our rights, to have our affairs administered by those men whom the King indicates—by those whom he loves and trusts---by those who will be content to be his servants, not his masters and ours.

I cannot forbear from thinking, that if the Right Hon. Gentleman had condescended to be this *acecession* to His Majesty's Government, some benefit might have derived from his services. I think he would not have sat silent behind the Treasury Bench, or have expressed his dissatisfaction privately to Mr. CANNING, when that Right Hon. Gentleman promulgated his flagitious doctrine of “Men—not Measures;” I think he would have thundered against those Committees of fear and despondency in which Colonel CRAWFORD leads the van, and Mr. WINDHAM brings up the rear! Certain it is that he would have needed no Plain Answerer to attack *every* act of the Government, to libel majorities of the House of Commons, to condemn the peace he himself had applauded, and to abuse the Ministers whose encomium he had solemnly pronounced!!

Surely there is nothing hostile in wishing any thing to the Right Hon. Gentleman that might have spared him the character in which he appears as the patron of this writer. Whether I look to the Jacobin cant and hypocrisy of majorities, voting “from inflamed passion,” or, “against their vote of yesterday;” or to the insi-

nuation

nuation against the *private* character of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the envious attack upon his conduct in the Speaker's Chair; or the assertion, that the Continent of Europe considers the justice of the war as on the side of France; or the miserable malice against myself, I turn from his defence with a disgust and pity that no enemy could feel!—

If it is not enough for Mr. ADDINGTON to express disapprobation of my pages, what atonement—what expiation can be offered for these? Is it for Mr. PITT to say or to countenance, that “he thinks well of Mr. ADDINGTON's private character in *many respects?*”* that his conduct in the Speaker's Chair was nothing “but complaisance and management,” and “that he assumed the *appearances* only of higher qualifications?”† Is it for Mr. Pitt to abet his miserable scribe in such low detraction as the following: “no man is more courteous than Mr. ADDINGTON,—no man takes so much pains to recommend himself universally.” “I cannot suppose that he has been deficient in every dutiful attention in a *certain quarter.* It is to be hoped that in advancing himself, in recommending his own pretensions, he has been careful not to depreciate those of others!”‡

These low and dirty calumnies deserve no answer. When did Mr. ADDINGTON *advance* him-

* P. 78

† P. 79.

‡ Ibid.

self?

self? When did he recommend his own pretensions? Whom has he depreciated? Upon whose subject has he poisoned the Royal Ear? Not certainly upon Mr. PITT's, whom it is not denied, that he would have recommended to His Majesty to re-admit into his Cabinet, not only upon a footing of equality with himself, but far beyond it, * and the negotiation for whose re-admission the P. A. *contends, originated with him!*

Why does he think Mr. ADDINGTON had not *real* titles to the reputation he acquired in the Chair of the House of Commons? Why does he think well of his *private* character only in many respects? Let him speak out—why not in all?

The Right Hon. Gentleman and his friends (as they call themselves) complain of misrepresentation and calumny—with what grace let the world decide—even if they had cause or pretence for it. The C. R. have touched no *private* character but to commend it; and they are even taxed by the P. A. with malice for not containing a panegyric upon Mr. WINDHAM's chivalrous nature, his academical acquirements, and even his manners as a gentleman."† I really did not know that it was expected from me to pronounce his eulogium—it was with his inconsisten-

* Cursory Remarks, p. 46.

† P. A. p. 39.

ties as a statesman that my business lay, and not with his happy gifts or acquirements.*

It was as the secret opposer of the negotiations at Lisle, and their public defender—as the organ and father of the militia and volunteers while he was in office, and their most strenuous enemy upon the Opposition Bench—as the great inciter and provoker of the war—as the Statesman, who on the 9th of November, “ WOULD HAVE ANTICIPATED THE BLOW,” and who contended on the 2d of March, when it was struck, that “ HE WAS THE VERY LAST MAN WHO COULD BE SUPPOSED READY TO PROPOSE THE RENEWAL OF HOSTILITIES.”

It was with the magnanimous versatility of Mr. WINDHAM, (which the Plain Answerer thinks I have *not* proved) that I thought I had to do, and not with the rest of his chivalry; but since the Answerer will have more of his character from my pencil, and least a second charge of envy should be brought against me, I will essay

* I might plead however in defence or apology for these omissions, that I have not set down his “ imprudence”—his “ indiscretions”—his “ extremes”—and his feeling it “ as a duty to urge and press his own opposite opinions then most, when he most disagrees with the sentiments of the public.” P. A. p. 41. I might alledge, that in commanding him as a scholar and a gentleman, I have taken no pains to shew his unsuitness for the chief place in an Administration. Perhaps Mr. WINDHAM may have as little reason to be satisfied with the infidious panegyric of the Plain Answerer as with any censure I may have taken the liberty of hazarding against his political conduct. A low rival is more to be dreaded than a liberal enemy.

the task, not without consciousness of my inability to do it justice.

I would represent him then, if I were able, as a man of a sagacious but eccentric mind, and of a strong, vigorous and cultivated understanding. He has wit, learning, talents, and a masculine eloquence, formed rather to coerce than persuade, with a certain loftiness of nature which pierces through the happiest temper and the easiest conversation. He is great in the moments of relaxation, and amiable when the bow is bent.—What does the P. A. think of my picture?—He intrigues for no statues—he celebrates no birthdays—he mendicates no popularity—he listens to no lying ballads written in his own praise, by his own creatures—his ambition stoops to nothing mean—he does nothing *serviliter pro dominatione*; shall I add, that I know of no private gentleman more entitled to respect, esteem, and admiration; that in *him* I perceive with pride, the noble English character, the generous taste and virtue of the soil, and that I know of no glass in which the rising talents, the ambition, and the hope of the country can dress themselves more becomingly! What says the corrector of misrepresentations and calumnies?—Speak out, Sir—am I a vile dauber, or do you acknowledge a likeness? Do you perceive whom it does resemble, and of what medal it might serve almost for the reverse?

Still for all this I must lament, (lament the more for

for all this) the inconstancy of his opinions, the discordance of his recorded votes, the irreconcileable inconsistencies and contradictions of his public conduct. They are of a character too flagrant and too formidable in example, particularly by the side of so much that is seductive and amiable—for

————— “ In a false disloyal knave—
These are but tricks of custom ; but, in a man that’s just,
they are most unpardonable, most unjust, and
most dangerous to the cause of virtue.

What pity is it that his “ chivalrous nature” can dispute no laurels but his own, that no other champion seems worthy of his prowess, and that he disdains every victory which he does not snatch from himself!—He appears to me to play with his reputation too much like children, who build up houses with cards to shew their skill, and throw them down to exhibit their force ; so has he played at militia and at volunteers, so at peace and war, so at vigour beyond the law, and other dangerous games, till one would hardly be astonished to catch him playing at prudential revolt, and majesty of the people !

The Plain Answerer has furnished a long catalogue of the errors and misconduct in Ministers, upon which Mr. PITT “ *might* have been dissatisfied.”* There is however only one objection in my mind of sufficient consequence to require the

* P. 67, and elsewhere.

slightest

lightest observation. This applies to the conduct of the negotiations with France, for as to the charge of having misled the public as to the probability of the duration of the late peace, it is “*too foolish, almost too insulting to be noticed.*” I cannot repent of a single syllable that I have uttered upon that subject. I do think at this moment, after the maturest deliberation, that whoever *confided* in the *duration* of that peace was not imposed upon by the representations of Ministers, but by the weakness of his own judgment.

As to them, they were peculiarly bound to abstain from every expression which could have been misunderstood or misrepresented by the French Cabinet, or which could have irritated the vainest and most irascible of mankind. A doubt of the continuance of peace in *their mouth* had been almost a declaration of war; nor could they indulge in reflections upon the character and disposition of Bonaparte, the true problem of the peace. It was to their acts that every candid man must have looked for their opinion. They maintained a peace establishment of 50,000 seamen,* and out of the whole army (with the exception of a few regiments of cavalry, whose reform was

* Mr. PITT’s Peace Establishment in 1792, upon the eve of the war, and when every man of common understanding must have seen that the duration of the Peace was to the full as problematical as in 1802, was 15,000!!!

loudly

loudly demanded upon account of the scarcity of grain, and for motives of economy,) they disbanded not more than 1500 men; out of these too, one thousand were discharged from the guards by their officers as being under the standard height.* The violence and the insolence of France were before the public, and the pretension of her Government to preclude us from all interference with the affairs of the Continent was repelled by the solemn assertion of His Majesty's right and resolution to act upon it, in his speech upon the opening of the session of Parliament.†

This the P. A. with the new decency of the **PITT** and **GRENVILLE** vocabulary, calls “a master-piece of unmeaning and indefinite composition, to be construed hereafter as circumstances and occasions might require.” But no man can join in so foolith an invective, but those who believe that His Majesty could have intended under any possible circumstances to ratify the arrogant pretension of the First Consul; and that if he had intended it, he would have recorded, in the archives of the nation, his most solemn declaration to the contrary!!

I cannot therefore withdraw my expression, that whoever, with all these documents before him, *could confide in the duration of the late peace*, was

* Parliamentary Debates; Chancellor of the Exchequer, December 14, 1803.

† Nov. 3, 1802, vide the C. R. p. 36.

nature's fool and not the Chancellor of the Exchequer's. The gentleman who writes under the signature of a Member of Parliament, does not scruple the mean artifice of misquoting in order to misrepresent me. For "*confiding in duration of the peace*, he cites me, *under inverted commas*, as saying "*that whoever believed in the probability of peace*," &c. To such disingenuous and dishonourable dealing there is no answer but contempt. Indeed the writer has since affixed his name to his publication, and I am revenged.*

The P. A. disapproves of the terms of the late peace, and doubts whether it were not impolitic to have concluded it—is it not wonderful what liberties his people take with Mr. PITTS, now too, that it is *certain* how angry he was with Mr. CANNING? I am miserably scolded too, for thinking that the terms of a peace might be better than any one expected, and yet the peace itself most uncertain and problematical. Many persons, I believe, will be dull enough not to per-

* Some persons have taken offence at my expression, whom I should the least have suspected of requiring to be referred to their Dictionary.—Dr. JOHNSON says—

To confide—confident—confidence—to *put one's trust in—firm belief—assured beyond doubt—trusting without limits—secure of success, &c. &c.* Query, had the ingenuous Member of Parliament looked at the Dictionary before he substituted his own trivial expression?

ceive any inconsistency in me, nor any motive for the silly triumph of my opponent upon this topic. *His* opinion upon the terms of the peace is good for nothing, we have his master's authority against him; upon the uncertainty of the peace Mr. **PITT**'s opinion is also with me, and the P. A. has even cited him for it.*

The continuance of the peace however, as I apprehend, did not depend upon the merit of the terms, but upon the secret mind of the enemy; so that its conditions might even have been "brilliant," (for which expression I am falsely cited, by the *accurate* P. A.) and its duration problematical.

When the hostile resolution of the French Government was ascertained beyond a doubt by our Ambassador, and instead of receiving satisfaction for the wrongs we complained of, we were ordered to evacuate Malta, or to prepare for his invasion, Lord WHITWORTH returned and the war followed, for which we had during two months been making vigorous preparations.—Does Mr. **PITT** doubt of this hostile disposition?—If not, it is a great pity that he should disapprove of the negotiations.

Upon this head I find two objections—first, "that we ought to have treated with all our conquests in our hands," secondly, "that we were

* P. A. p. 75.

firm where we ought to have been conciliating, and conciliating where we ought to have been firm. Had our conduct therefore been completely inverted, the P. A. is of opinion, that we might still have remained at peace.*

My answer must necessarily be concise, but I hope it will be able to avoid obscurity. To the first objection I reply, that if we had made none of the restitutions stipulated in the treaty, we could have had no pretence to resent the conduct of the French. Had we given no proof of our own good faith, what ground could we have assigned for complaining of the duplicity of the Consul? But we wavered about the Cape of Good Hope! We did so. When Switzerland implored our interference, we withheld the Cape; when it was ascertained that no Continental Power would defend those unfortunate Cantons, and they determined to make no effort of themselves, we proceeded in the evacuation. I know it may be said, that **BONAPARTE**, by a fraudulent peace, has swindled us out of this and other possessions. For my part, I confess, that I would by no means have it otherwise. The Cape of Good Hope, with Martinique, and all the rest of our restitutions, are better in his hands than in ours, for there they stand a fixed and incontestible monument of the British honour and sincerity.

* P. 95.

There they prove that we were ingenuous, and earnest in our desire to maintain the Peace, and that we proceeded with good faith in the execution of its provisions; neither can any statesman be blind or perverse enough to pretend that any great danger or important difficulty will result in this war, from their transfer to an enemy alike destitute of a military marine, and commercial resources. Such a man will not weigh a distant colony, and an anchorage, against the opinion and favour of the universe.

To the second objection it need only be answered, that we were conciliatory in the beginning, and firm at the end of the negotiation; and that the opposite mode was not so prosperous in the hands of Mr. PITT and his colleagues, as to have given him any just right of prescribing it to future Administrations.

How did he treat with Catharine the Second, in 1791, when he mediated in the cause of Turkey, and eventually of Poland; when Prussia was our ally, and eager to drive back the Russian empire to its Asian confine? Have we forgotten the armament of that year, and the tone that accompanied it? Did he not command that potent Princess to evacuate *Oczakow*, or prepare for war, in the very tones of BONAPARTE, who has unluckily taken him only so far for his prototype and his model? Here then was firmness in the beginning,

ginning, and there was no want of conciliation in the end; for he most obligingly retracted every firm word he had uttered; and least his own minister should be discredited for his versatility, he allowed the opposition benches to be publicly represented at St. Petersburg, and the treaty signed by Mr. FAULKNER, to be guaranteed by Mr. ROBERT ADAIR, the minister plenipotentiary of Mr. Fox and his party!

So in the affair of Copenhagen, how firm was he in the beginning! His negotiator proceeded, escorted by a formidable armament, under a most gallant Admiral, to demand reparation; but, in the conclusion, came his never-failing conciliation, and nothing was repaired—but the Freya! So too in Egypt, his firmness in the beginning, cancelled the treaty of El-Arisch; and his conciliation, in the end, would have restored it—had it not been too late!! Neither does Lord GRENVILLE arrange his fortitude and condescension in a happier order, for that great Minister had unluckily thrown away all his conciliation upon BARRAS, MERLIN, and LEPEAU, and reserved nothing but firmness for BONAPARTE!

It cannot therefore be allowed that Mr. ADDINGTON had so completely *misplaced* these celebrated qualities in the late negotiations; neither can it be admitted that there exists any reason for lamenting that the peace was not continued after

Lord WHITWORTH had ascertained the hostile resolution of the First Consul. Will the P. A. tell me how this peace was to be prolonged, but by proceeding in the restitution of these places, with which he would have had us negotiate in our own hands? Or will *he* say that the peace, as experience had shewn it, was such a state as any wise Minister would have been anxious to prolong?

But there would have been still a greater danger, if the conciliation and firmness of Ministers had followed Mr. PITTR's order instead of their own; for, in that case, who will say that the quarrel might not have been precipitated, before the people were convinced that it was not to be avoided? Malta, and all the colonies of France, Spain, and Holland, put together, are not to be weighed against the conviction of the country in the justice of its cause, and the inevitable necessity of the war!

I profess that I have always considered the King's message of the 8th of March, to have been a wise, vigorous, and well-timed measure! It is mere folly to enquire too nicely what exact quantity of force the First Consul had in readiness upon that day, upon the coasts of Holland, and the Channel. He had an expedition prepared, perhaps for the mouths of the Mississippi; but certainly disposable for other objects, and

easily convertible into an attack upon our own shores. He kept, against the faith of a treaty, a great army in Holland, which he had taken oftenable measures to withdraw, but whose march he had countermanded.

But if he had not possessed such powerful or such evident means of sudden aggression, were the British Ministers bound to wait, with crossed arms, till they were greater; and when the arrogant Consul, instead of granting satisfaction for our injuries, commanded us "to evacuate Malta, or expect his invasion;" were they to muster his troops and gun boats, and to postpone all defence till they received the *procès-verbal* of his armaments?

Not less absurd is the complaint, that they have not selected the best or most perspicuous motives for the war. They have selected nothing. It is in vain to represent them as having insisted upon this point, and conceded that, as if there had been a series of negotiations, upon some of which they had received satisfaction, or abandoned their complaint, while they strenuously persisted in others. There has been but one; and to the very hour of Lord WHITWORTH's departure from the French capital, that negotiation has embraced every point, from the Fame packet to the mission of Sebastiani. Nobody knows better than Mr. PITT, that Malta is but a part of the cause of the war;

and

and that it is BONAPARTE, not the King's Ministers, who have made that island the direct occasion of hostilities.

I am sorry to observe, by the undistinguishing censure of the P. A. that Mr. PITTR does intend a systematic, and a general opposition. From Ireland to Holland, and from Hanover to the Volunteers, he ranges the whole circle of all possible cavil and chicane. From me it can scarcely be expected to discuss all these questions, nor indeed any not connected with the state of parties; but I cannot refrain from observing, that it is singular if government has been remiss, erroneous, or criminal, upon any of these subjects, that Mr. PITTR's "*tenderness*" should still operate to detain him from his place, (I mean from behind the Treasury Bench.)—Why has no motion been made, or enquiry instituted into every part of this mass of delinquency? Why have we no fresh impeachments, and no new orders of the day?

Certainly I shall not undertake the defence of the Regency of Hanover, for not transporting their army, which would not have been transported; nor of the English Ministers for not having sent away ours to the Continent, for which Parliament would, I think, have been moved to impeach them! Neither shall I stand up the unnecessary champion of Lord HARDWICK's most mild, firm, and constitutional administration. The lawful character of the state trials, under his government,

vernment, may be a painful comment upon former times, and have given the same species of offence, as was caused by the repeal of the sedition bills, and the restoration of the habeas corpus act, in this part of the empire. But it were an unfortunate constitution of the human mind, against which I would have the P. A. put his friends on their guard, to look upon the virtues of others, as the studied reproach of their own failings; and to find, in every thing lenient or wise, the secret censure and condemnation of themselves!

Upon the volunteer system, I shall content myself with defying the P. A. to produce one instance of discouragement upon the part of Ministers. If they ought to accept a greater number of offers, why is no motion made to compel them? As far as I have observed, Ministers have never shrank from discussion; they have rather courted and provoked it; even upon the subject of Mr. ADDINGTON's financial statement of the 10th of December, 1802, which is the sole measure, if it may be called so, of his administration, upon which he had any intimation that Mr. PITT did not agree with him, *before* the tenderness of his order of the day.

But if to discourage the volunteer army be an act of delinquency, with what decency does the P. A. assume the defence of Mr. WINDHAM?* He "thanks God they could not be dispirited;" and,

* P. 69.

with

with this sanctimonious appeal in his mouth, he attributes the attempt to dispirit them to the Minister, and not to Mr. WINDHAM.—Can I apprehend from an accuser of this character?

It will be pardoned me, if I say a few words upon one or two insulated points, where I have not been understood, or where I have been misrepresented. The plain P. A. does not comprehend what I mean, by saying that the country governs itself in some measure, *under* the present Ministers and *for them*, and the Member of Parliament professes the same tardiness of apprehension. Doubtless I owe some apology for the obscurity of my expression to these very luminous writers. Their meaning is always clear, their phrase perspicuous, and their reasoning unanswerable. Such cannot be the lot of common men; nor is it for me to pretend to gifts or advantages like theirs. I have to lament that my pages have passed under no other than my own defective observation. No committee has sat in friendly criticism; no quondam Minister inspired or revised them. Neither had I time or leisure for that “formal adjustment of sentences,” that “framing” and “labouring of style,” for which the candid P. A. is pleased to give me credit. He may believe, if he pleases, that I had no Minerva but Mr. PATTEN and the 3d of June. Indignation, however, sometimes makes prose as well as verses,

It

It looks indeed as if the dependents of Mr. PITT were rather wilfully perplexed for the sense of a phrase so trivial and familiar. Had I said "*for the sake of Ministers*," they would probably have comprehended me; but the effort was too great to explain, *for them*, by its equivalent. The public, however, could not mistake me: for it knows, and daily confesses, by some proof of patriotism, and zeal, and personal sacrifice, the value of a mild and congenial government, sympathizing with the national character, and the true organ of its own feelings and principles. That the nation governs itself more *for them* than for their predecessors, witness those severe and despotic laws, which have been repealed without the least infraction of their enactments, if they had continued in force; witness that Habeas Corpus Act, which has been restored without the smallest danger or ill consequence; witness the trials of Despard and Emmet, with the traitors in their train, which were conducted, with all the form, delay, and tranquillity of the most ordinary prosecutions, and the happiest times; witness that spontaneous and consenting burst of public spirit and affection, which, by an effort of which there is no example, has given them a patriot army, the flower and choice of every rank, order, and profession in the state! Witness that very charge, absurd and perfidious as it is, that they

they have *checked* the ardour, that they have *bridled* the enthusiasm of the country !!

How different from those unfortunate and guilty times, which some of us may remember, when a discontented and alienated people felt something consoling in the public calamities, from the mortification of insolence and pride, and the humiliation of arrogant and odious authority !

The advocate of Mr. PITT has made an extraordinary discovery, that the habits of Mr. ADDINGTON's life, as he calls his services in the Speaker's Chair, have disqualifid him for a Minister of State ! Why then did not this Chair disqualify My Lord Treasurer OXFORD, or the great Lord GRENVILLE himself ? Perhaps it might be worth while to consider well, if time permitted it, what habits and studies are best calculated to produce a Statesman, since the House of Commons is pronounced not only a bad school, but a disqualifying apprenticeship ; and since the anathema comes from so high an authority. Perhaps the time may come for a sober inquiry, whether the worst, the very worst consequence of our public debt, be not the species of necessity it has imposed upon us of taking the first men out of the second rank of abilities ; and subduing the science of the state under that of the Stock Exchange. Perhaps it were to the full as wise to suspect that the familiarity of Custom Houses,

Houses, Excise Offices, and the loan brokers, were as *disqualifying* for great comprehensive and lofty thoughts, as the presidency in Parliament; and that plodding arithmetic neither enlarges the heart, nor elevates the soul, nor strengthens the intellectual eye, to take in the vast horizon of a Statesman's meditation. How might our great deliverer shudder in his tomb, if he could know that the public debt, he instituted for a domestic object of policy, had entailed this curse upon his people, that their affairs should necessarily be governed by mediocrity, and that to all the talents and enterprize, and ambition and power of France, they were doomed only to oppose the sublime of calculation, and the genius of finance !

Surely we have had experience sufficient during the last war of the empire of the budget; but if Mr. PITT knew the disqualifying quality of the Speaker's Chair, and Mr. ADDINGTON's unfitness for the Ministry, what possible excuse will he make for the famous panegyric in which he pronounced him "all in all sufficient"?—Here then behold another *calumny* of the Cursory Remarks, substantiated by his defender!

This gentleman next prefers rather a singular charge against His Majesty's Ministers, for having promoted the learning and piety of Dr. Horsely, notwithstanding that this Reverend Lord had given a vote against them in Parliament!!! Let their enemies

enemies defend them against an accusation like this !

Another chapter of delinquency is, their having accepted the services of Mr. TIERNEY ; upon which I shall only remark, that I am much deceived, if there has not been a time at which Mr. PITR himself pointed out the advantage of obtaining the assistance of this gentleman.

The next head of indictment regards Mr. SHERIDAN, and the Ministers, for having sometimes been assisted by the masterly eloquence of that accomplished Senator. Did Mr. PITR never commit this very crime ? and has Mr. SHERIDAN ever neglected an opportunity of coming to the succour of the State, in every crisis and embarrassment ? Need I mention the mutiny, the invasion, or any other occasion seized by the Honourable Gentleman, of offering up the passions of party upon the altar of his country ? Oh, but "*he says* he will accept no office from Mr. ADDINGTON." Thus the P. A. expresses his incredulity ; and, indeed, a profession of this nature must naturally appear incredible to the friends of the late Ministers. Could they not wait, however, till he had forfeited his pledge ? If he has given such a one, I can only say I am truly sorry, because I think he will *not* forfeit it ; but I hope it is conditional, *trebly conditional*, like another pledge, of which the bond has been cancelled, by a sentence

tence from Tully's Offices!! But I do not recollect that Mr. SHERIDAN ever asked any office from Mr. PITT. Why may he not render equal services to the country under Mr. ADDINGTON, with equal disinterestedness? It is a peevish and a rude insinuation, and as void of all "good taste," as any language of Lord GRENVILLE'S.* I can hardly think Mr. CANNING saw it before it was in print.

The P. A. with a most curious felicity, next complains of the "severe and rigid proscription applied to Lord GRENVILLE;" in English, that when Mr. PITT made his Lordship's admission the *sine quâ non* of the negotiation, Mr. ADDINGTON did not submit. I have only to say, that I know not of one member of his Lordship's family, and his *proscribed* connections, or of Mr. PITT's either, who is not prodigally provided for at the expence of the public, with the single exception of poor Lord TEMPLE, who therefore alone, of all his race, can, with much propriety, cry aloud for places. I know not of another exception, from the great Leviathan in the Exchequer, to the little Nautilus in the Custom-house.

If I have been guilty of any error or misrepresentation, in calling this *proscribed* family "in-

* P. A. p. 31.

fatiab'e'

fatiabie" in its appetency for places and emoluments, I shall submit implicitly to any censure the public may pronounce; but, in the mean time, let the P. A. learn to respect the nepotism of Mr. PITT, which all my *malice* had suffered to rest in oblivion!

Before I conclude these pages, I would offer an apology for one expression of mine, if I thought it possible for the great mind of Mr. Fox to have been affected by it.

What I have said, appears to me to have been indispensable in a discourse upon the state of parties; nor can I recall it. My opinion was honest and sincere; nor is it staggered by the *paix-fourrée*, between him and the WINDHAMS; nor would it be so, although Mr. PITT were to become *an accession* to the confederates. Nothing, however, but wilful dullness, added to invincible malevolence, could have found any illiberal imputation in the opinion I have delivered, or have made it necessary for me to explain it. I am as far from suspecting Mr. Fox of a single dishonourable action, or dishonourable thought, as any gentleman in England. I had no allusion to any connexion or favour at the French Court, from which I think him as far removed as any one of the King's Ministers; but I think him pledged to so many rash and dangerous measures, such as the Catholic question, the repeal of the Tests,

Tests, the abolition of the Slave Trade, and the Reform of Parliament, that it is impossible, in the present state of the monarchy, to anticipate the direction of affairs committed to his hands. It will be said, “to which of these innovations has not Mr. PITT been pledged also?” But Mr. Fox will not be offended with me, if I say that the cases are not equivalent, for *his* opinions (at least I think I have *observed* so) are his principles, and he will redeem his pledges, if he is able, which may not be done without extreme hazard shall I say? or certain ruin of the monarchy: not certainly (he will not deny it) without a great convulsion and crisis of the constitution.

The P. Answerer is not pleased to consider any of the circumstances, in the negotiation for Mr. PITT’s return to office, as justifying such an expression as “a scramble for place.” The confessions of Lord TEMPLE have no effect upon him. Mr. CANNING cries “men not measures” in vain!! I have not therefore the vanity of aspiring to convince him. That Mr. PITT sees some danger, or feels some disgust at some parts and in some quarters, where this *scramble* is very evident even to distant observers, I have better hope: although, imperfect and precarious, his coalition with the GRENVILLES, and the *Ex-war-faction*, has already plunged him into difficulties, from which, without much time, patience, and address,

dress, he cannot easily be extricated. The very first step in which they engaged him, is endless error and irremovable perplexity.

The P. A. talks of “a short turn;” but was there ever turn so short, so sudden and abrupt, as that which set his face against Mr. ADDINGTON, which made him commence with impeachment, an opposition to the Ministers, with whom he had divided upon *every* question? which placed him in the ranks of the WINDHAMS and GRENVILLES, against whom he had constantly defended them? Was not this turn so short, as to throw aside from him the very skirts of public principle, and expose the naked deformity of his ambition? Is it not this turn which has set him so low, that he may be seen confidently beckoned over the House to close one of the sides of Mr. Fox, while Mr. WINDHAM occupies the other? Sublime spectacle of virtue, disinterestedness, and public spirit! How imposing, to use its own energetic language, will be the attitude of the people’s majesty, between its anti-jacobin supporters!

Is it the language of animosity, to call to the Right Honourable Gentleman, before he passes, to arrest his most dangerous course, and remind him of his better fame? Is it enmity that warns him from the opprobious post he holds, detractor of the Ministers, whom he dares not but to support —

port—fellow-labourer with an opposition, he detests and fears! Let him not think that

“ Going back were tedious as going o'er,”
but make haste,

Revocare gradum superasque evadere ad auras.

He will not be an *accession* to Mr. ADDINGTON's administration! Does he hope then to *preside* over Mr. Fox, or even Mr. WINDHAM and Lord GRENVILLE?

One gentleman* tells me there is but one point of difference between this noble Lord, and the Right Honourable Gentleman—a trifle—a nonsense—a nothing.—Only the Treaty of Amiens, and Peace and War—not worth thinking of!
“ They are,” he says,

“ hâc in re scilicet unâ
Multum dissimiles, at cœtera pñne gemelli.”

But is he quite sure that there are no other toys, no newer playthings, about which these little twins are in the habit of falling out? that they are not only

Concordes animæ nunc et dum nocte prementur?

I confess I should consider them as no favourable sign in the political Zodiac, and if they must rise together, I rather apprehend

———— quantum inter se bellum
Quantis acies stragemque ciebunt!

* Brief Ans. p. 53.

Has any important point in the P. Answerer escaped me? have I omitted to repel any false allegation? If I have imposed silence upon myself in one or two instances, such as the misdirection of our army to the siege of Dunkirk, and the negotiations at Lisle, upon which that writer has imprudently taken up the gauntlet, it is not to be imputed to any other motive than my perfect satisfaction that the universal opinion of the public is with me already, and that all confirmation were superfluous. Have I given any false colours, or distorted features, to the distinguished characters involved in the subject of my discussion? "To all," replies the P. Answerer, "you have misrepresented and calumniated them all—have I not proved it in my *title page*?" Let us see then how he has presented his own hero, upon his own canvas; with what gracious tints he has decked out the god of his idolatry! We will take the tour of the gallery, and contemplate the portraits of the master from his own school.

Here you behold him drawn in the act of resignation, not upon some solemn cause, nor with dignity in the manner, but in a peevish fit, and with a fretful air, for a few words and *circumstances*, about no matter what*. Here he is pourtrayed, making gracious offers to his Sovereign to remain in office (in spite of the *circumstances*, which made it "inconsistent with his *duty* and his ho-

nour to remain"*) until the country should be relieved from its most pressing difficulties, which had no existence! which I invented two years and a half afterwards!—There, he selects a successor † disqualified "by the habits of his life," while he pledges himself to an assembled Senate for his qualification and sufficiency!—In this picture he is shewn in the act of promising constant, active and zealous support upon *three* mystical conditions.‡—In its companion you behold him consulting the casuists, in order to demonstrate that no condition ought to bind him.§ Next we are shewn him embarking, without a scruple, the whole of the public fortune in the good ship, which God preserve; and immediately after we behold him refusing to trust his own private venture on board her.|| In the opposite frame he is painted with scowling brows, "dissatisfied and disapproving of the conduct"¶ of one of his dependents; and Oh shame! Oh falling off indeed! His dependent "disapproving and dissatisfied with him!"

Again, he is represented in humble attitude, receiving the "foolish and insulting proposition"** from Lord MELVILLE, and meekly listening to the "dictation"†† of the imperious Mr. ADDINGTON; but in the next frame you observe him arrogantly demanding from his Sovereign the power of no-

* P. A. p. 7. † P. A. p. 8. ‡ P. A. p. 17.

§ Brief A. p. 18. || P. A. 29. ¶ P. A. p. 42, 43.

** P. A. p. 24. †† P. A. p. 51.

minating every counsellor in whom it may be lawful for His Majesty to confide.*

Now he is sketched in the act of rejoicing at disappointment, and feeling “ relief” † in miscarriage; now hesitating, whether to be the colleague or the impeacher of his brother and his friend;— in the third pannel you see him moving the famous order of the day. The “ tenderness” ‡ of his expression is commonly admired, but the *virtuosi* discover something *sardonic* in his smile.

We have passed by two or three history pieces in the ante-room. In the first you discover him sending out a mighty fleet without instructions to fight, and “ *extorting*” § from Denmark the right of repairing her frigate in the dock of Portsmouth! In the second he is concealing favourable intelligence from his own officers in Egypt||.

Next he appears sealing a dispatch which causes the events you observe designed in the back ground — the rupture of a treaty, and the massacre of an unarmed host! ¶ In the pendant to this picture he is shewn laughing at his mistake, and hugging himself that it was a mere question of policy! ** Upon a fifth pannel he is represented *triumphing* for the victorious battles of Copenhagen and Alexandria,

* P. A. p. 25. † P. A. p. 51. ‡ P. A. p. 22 and 53.
§ P. A. p. 16. || P. A. p. 15. ¶ P. A. p. 13. ** P. A. p. 14.

because

because he resigned so many weeks before they were fought.* The slave who, according to the antient Roman custom,† stands in the car with him, I take for granted, is the Plain Answerer!

It is full time to quit this exhibition—I am no artist—a mere amateur! and it was I think unfair to force me to take the profile of Mr. WINDHAM. I am far from saying “*Sono pittore anch’io;*” but I will be judged whether from my *malicious* pallet has not proceeded a more flattering resemblance than can be found in the best portraits of Mr. PITT, the *chef-d’œuvres* of his own academicians and associates!

I am very sensible that I have trespassed too long upon the favour and attention of my readers, and I hasten to release them. The perplexity and danger of the state are legible to the dullest eye, the difficulties of Government are assembled from every quarter, and are of every character and description. It is perhaps satisfactory to hear Mr. PITT announce,‡ that “France cannot succeed;” but we must recollect that this part of politics is not his peculiar department, and that BONAPARTE is of a different opinion, while the whole world looks on with doubt and anxiety. It were to be wished, that no human means should be neglected

* P. A. 46.

† According to the antient custom, but not the antient motive—

Et *sibi* Consul

Ne placeat, curru servus portatur eodem.

‡ P. Ans. in fine.

:

of

of diminishing even the chances of the success of France. Whether undermining the confidence of the people, in the abilities of the King's Ministers, at an unhappy moment too, when nothing very short of a revolution could replace them; whether precipitating irreverent and unfeeling enquiries, and attempting to undraw the curtains of that sacred couch, before which the affections of a nation kneel with trembling hope and awful anxiety; whether decrying the constitution of the public force, and ridiculing its exertion; whether distracting the Admiralty with motions of enquiry, while the enemy perhaps waits but for a wind to assail us; and whether monstrous leagues of discordant elements, and hostile principles, the union of hatreds, and the coalition of antipathies, be better calculated to effect this object, than suspended rivalry, than ambition sacrificed to the public safety, than the firm phalanx of affectionate unanimity in our country's cause—I submit to the conscientious consideration of all our parties!

London,
March 9th, 1804,

ERRATA.

P. 41, last line but 3, for *DIF*, read *FALL*; p. 52, last line (note), for p. 5, read p. 45; p. 55, l. 14, for *they*, read *the conditions*; p. 58, l. 21, for *concur*, read *contribute*; p. 64, third line from the bottom, for *or*, read *or*.

Printed by C. Richey,
Peterborough-court, Fleet-street.

The following BOOKS and PAMPHLETS, among others, are published by J. HATCHARD, Bookseller to Her Majesty, No. 190, Piccadilly.

1. **A COLLECTION** of public Acts and Papers, relating to the Principles of armed Neutrality, brought forward in the Years 1780 and 1781; one volume 8vo. 5s. boards.

2. The Anti-Jacobin; or, Weekly Examiner, originally published in 1797 and 1798; a new Edition, revised, corrected, and uniformly printed in two large vols. 8vo. 18s. boards.—The object of this work is well known; it is worthy of being placed in every distinguished Library in the kingdom.

3. The Poetry to the Anti-Jacobin, beautifully printed in one vol. crown 8vo. 5s. boards.

4. The Bavaid and Maeviad, with other new Matter. A new Edition in the press.

5. Substance of the Speech of the Rt. Hon. H. Addington, Dec. 10, 1802. Second Edition, 1s.

6. Substance of the Speech of the Rt. Hon. H. Addington, Feb. 12, 1799, in the Committee of the whole House, to whom His Majesty's Message of Jan. 22, relative to an Union between Great Britain and Ireland, was referred, 1s.

7. Speech of the Rt. Hon. W. Pitt, Jan. 31, 1799, on offering to the House the Resolutions proposed as the Basis of an Union between Great Britain and Ireland. Eighth Edition, 1s. 6d.—Also,

8. His Speech delivered Feb. 3, 1800, on a Motion for an Address to the Throne, approving of the Answers returned to the Communications from France, relative to a Negotiation for Peace. Fifth Edition, 2s.

9. Brief Examination into the Increase of the Revenue, Commerce, and Manufactures of Great Britain, from 1792 to 1799. By the Rt. Hon. Geo. Rose, M. P. 1s. 6d.

10. A Letter to the Proprietors of East India Stock, respecting the present Situation of the Company's Affairs both Abroad and at Home; in Answer to the Statements given in the latter Part of the Third Report of the Special Committee of the Court of Directors respecting private Trade, 3s.

11. A few CURSORY REMARKS on the STATE of PARTIES, during the Administration of the Rt. Hon. H. ADDINGTON. By a NEAR OBSERVER. Tenth Edition, 2s. 6d.

12. Considerations on the Debt on the Civil List, by the Rt. Hon. Geo. Rose, M. P. 1s. 6d.

13. Poems by John Penn, Esq. M. P. in two vols. royal 8vo. consisting of original Works, Imitations, and Translations; beautifully printed, and illustrated with elegant engravings, 11. 5s. boards.

14. Miscellaneous Poems on various Subjects, by the late Thomas Dermody, 12mo. 4s. 6d. boards.

15. The Valley of Llanherne, and other Pieces, in Verse, by John Fisher, A. B. 3s. 6d. boards.

16. The First and Fourth Books of the Odes of Horace, translated into English Verse, 2s. 6d. sewed.

17. A Poetical Epistle to Sir Geo. Beaumont, Bart. on the Encouragement of the British School of Painting, by William Sotheby, Esq. F. R. S. and A. S. S. 2s. 6d.

BOOKS published by J. HATCHARD.

18. Reports of the Society for bettering the Condition and increasing the Comforts of the Poor. Thrice vols. 12mo. 6s. sewed.

19. Elements of general Knowledge, introductory to useful Books in the principal Branches of Literature and Science. By Hen. Kett, B. D. Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford. Two vols. 8vo. 16s. boards.

20. Practical Observations on the Revelation of St. John, written in the Year 1775, by the late Mrs. Bowdler, neatly printed in crown 8vo. 5s.

21. Poems and Essays, by the late Miss Bowdler; to which is first added, An Essay on the Duties and Advantages of Sickness; beautifully printed, and an elegant Engraving of the Author. 11. 1s. boards.

22. Essays on the Happiness of the Life to Come, 6s. 6d. sewed.

23. The Cheap Repository Tracts—the genuine new corrected Edition, by Mrs. H. More, 3 vols. 15s. 6d.

24. Elements of Christian Theology, by the Lord Bishop of Lincoln, 2 vols. Third Edition, 16s. boards.

25. History the Interpreter of Prophecy; or, a View of Scripture Prophecies, &c. &c. &c. By Henry Kett, B. D. 2 vols. Third Edition, 14s.

26. A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life; abridged from the original Work of the Rev. W. Law, A. M. Third Edition, 1s. 6d. or 16s. per dozen.

27. Letter to a Member of the present House of Commons, 1s. 6d.

28. The Inquiry, a Poem, Part I. with Notes, neatly printed in 12mo. 2s. sewed.

29. The Progress of the Pilgrim Good Intent, in Jacobinical Times. Eighth Edition, 3s. 6d. neatly sewed.

30. A Treatise on the Functions and Duties of a Constable; containing Details and Observations interesting to the Public, as they relate to the Corruption of Morals, and the Protection of the peaceful Subject against penal and criminal Offences. By P. Colquhoun, Esq. LL.D.

31. An Account of Louisiana; being an Abstract of Documents delivered in or transmitted to Mr. Jefferson, President of the United States of America, by him laid before Congress, and published by their Order, 1s. 6d.

32. Britannicus to Buonaparte, an heroic Epistle, with Notes. By H. Tresham, Esq. R. A. With Frontispiece, 4s.

33. Elements of Opposition, 2s. 6d.

34. An Account of the Native Africans in the Neighbourhood of Sierra Leone; to which is added, an Account of the present State of Medicine among them. By Thomas Winterbottom, M. D. Physician to the Colony.—N. B. The first volume, in which are the Maps and Plates, may be had separate from the second, which contains the medical part of the work. The price of the first volume alone, is 9s.

35. Speedily, in an elegant quarto volume, to harmonize with the Works, the Life of the late Sir W. Jones, compiled by the Right Hon. Lord Teignmouth.

36. Reflections on the Causes of the War, and on the Conduct of His Majesty's Ministers, 2s. 6d.

37. Reflections on the Rupture with France, by John Adolphus, Esq. &c. 3s. 6d.

38. Facts and Illustrations relative to the Military Preparations carried on in France, in the interval between the Conclusion of the Treaty of Amiens, and the Commencement of the present War. Translated from the French of Sir Francis d'Ivernois. 3s.

*** J. H. has likewise constantly on Sale an extensive Assortment of the most generally esteemed Historical and Miscellaneous Works, as well as all the popular Pamphlets.

ρ

